NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

10¢

Royal Oak, Michigan | March 9, 1942 | Subscription Three Dollars Per Year

See Page 3 for Our

ANALYSIS OF THE PRESIDENT'S TALK

Administration's War Secrets Bill Would Be Tyranny

(See Page 5)

Economic 'Union Now' With Canada Proposed

(Page 6)

Churchill Puts Roosevelt 'On the Spot'

'SOCIAL JUSTICE' CELEBRATES A BIRTHDAY ★ A PLEA FOR 'MORE DEMOCRACY' ★ LITVINOV TOSSES ALLIES A VEILED WARNING

Dinner Chat

SOCIAL JUSTICE Six Years Old

WITH this issue, and this week, your National Magazine SOCIAL JUSTICE celebrates its sixth birthday anniversary.

The first issue of SOCIAL JUSTICE, read by some 500,000 Americans, made its appearance on March 13, 1936.

Defying the *tabu* of the superstitious regarding Friday, the 13th, and undertaking the publication of a national magazine of comment without the support of any advertising revenue, the infant venture flew in the face of several publishing traditions.

A publisher's announcement in that first edition read, in part, as follows:

"As SOCIAL JUSTICE makes its bow before the American public it is doing so with no apologies. A radio audience conservatively estimated to number 12 to 15-million persons, is, in our case, more than a mere audience. It is an organization known as the National Union for Social Justice . . .

"The reason for the existence of this newspaper becomes evident. Its pages will attempt to present *the philosophy of social justice* and, at the same time, to serve as an agent whose business it will be to maintain harmony of thought within the ranks of the National Union . . ."

16 PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

Liberty of conscience and education.
Just living annual wage.
Nationalization of important public resources.
Private ownership of all other property.
Control of private property for public good.
Abolition of Federal Reserve Banking System and establishment of a Government-owned Central Bank.
Restoration to Congress of its sole right to coin and regulate the value of money.
Cost of living maintained on an even keel.
Cost of production plus a fair profit for the farmer.
Labor's right to organize.
Recall of non-productive bonds.
Abolition of tax-exempt bonds.
Broadened base of taxation on basis of ownership and capacity to pay.
Simplification of Government and lower taxes.
Conscription of wealth as well as men in event of war.
Sanctity of human rights preferred to sanctity of property with Government's chief concern for the poor.

SOCIAL JUSTICE National Weekly. Copyrighted 1942 by the Social Justice Publishing Company, publication and editorial office, Royal Oak, Michigan. Subscription price, United States and possessions, $3.00 per year. Unless otherwise directed all subscriptions begin with the current issue. Three weeks are required to effect change of subscriber's address. Give both old and new addresses. Entered as second class matter, March 12, 1937, at the post office, Royal Oak, Michigan, under the Act of March 3, 1879. E. Perrin Schwartz, Editor; Cora Quinlan, Secretary-Treasurer.

SOCIAL JUSTICE is fully protected by copyright and nothing that appears in it may be reprinted either wholly or in part, without special permission. The use of articles or quotations from SOCIAL JUSTICE for digest, advertising, promotions and stock-selling schemes is never authorized.

Vol. 9 March 9, 1942 No. 10

That quotation will take many readers—as it does members of our editorial family — back over the eventful years that have intervened since the appearance of that first little tabloid news weekly. Week after week, SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine "called the turn"—as did the Sunday broadcasts of Father Coughlin—on national and world events, interpreting their significance and their trend.

An editorial in that first issue said:

"Is SOCIAL JUSTICE 'in politics' as the *art* of applying our principles to local facts by legislation? Most assuredly: the *Papal Encyclicals*, though dealing only with the principles of politics and economics, are not mere arm-chair essays.

"They are a crusader's cry, a call to arms, a practical plan of campaign, conjuring the faithful throughout Christendom to bestir themselves, to mobilize, and to apply these principles to local conditions!"

And in that first issue, also, Mr. Mark Meecham in his Washington comment, *"Eyes and Ears Over the Capitol,"* said:

"The President has called for a revenue bill to raise $1,139,000,000 in new taxes. He did not outline the method by which this money might be raised and is, in effect, 'passing the buck' to Congress . . ."

The complete text of Father Coughlin's broadcast for Sunday, February 23rd, 1936, was printed, its message occupied with constructive support of the thesis: *"The Money Changers Must Be Driven from the Temple of America by First Driving Their Servants from Congress!"*

* * *

Some of the outstanding headlines of that first issue read as follows:

"Colonel Frank Knox Confuses the Nation—Would-Be President Talks of Stabilizing a Gold Dollar on Non-Existent Supply of Gold."

"New Deal Insists We Pay the Fiddler."

"Administration Saved From Britain's Game—Alert Congress Averts Move to Play U.S. Into Hands of the 'Geneva Club'."

"Communism on the Air—The Columbia Broadcasting System Presents Earl Browder."

"Voters Are Through Being Fooled Over the Political 'Sham Battle'."

"Frazier-Lemke Farm Relief Bill Is Vital to All — Cities to Share in Its Benefits." There was also a table of Congressional signatures on the petition to force the Frazier-Lemke bill out of Chairman O'Connor's Rules Committee.

In addition, there were pages devoted to America's Youth; the affairs of the National Union; a digest of press reviews; letters from readers; two pages under the general caption of "Searchlight on the Money Changers"; and Father Coughlin's weekly editorial letter.

Five Year's Ago In SOCIAL JUSTICE

THE brief review of the contents of the first issue of SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine sent us leafing through the files to note the progress of our first year of publication. That "find," too, is worth reporting.

Here are some of the outstanding headlines of the edition for March 15, 1937—five years ago this week:

"U. S. IN DANGER AS SECOND WORLD WAR NEARS!—Bankers, Gun Makers Fan Fires for Profit."

"Message to Labor: Hold Your Lines!" This was an editorial comment on sit-down strikes in the 5 and 10 chain stores; in the course of which SOCIAL JUSTICE said:

"Labor, stand together! . . . While you are at it, strike for a living wage that will remain a living wage. SOCIAL JUSTICE is on the side of the laboring man in his battle for economic liberty. But SOCIAL JUSTICE will not applaud the mere striking for higher wages. It is saving its applause until victory comes. But, meanwhile, SOCIAL JUSTICE encourages you to carry on your warfare."

There was a report on a readers' poll, listing the percentages indicated by replies to two questions:

"Would America be a happier country if all politicians were liquidated: Yes, 63.5%; No, 36.5%"; and

"Is democracy obsolete and should there be substituted for it another form of government: Yes, 11.2%; No, 88.8%."

Other headlines in the issue of five years ago read:

"Private Poll of Senators Points Toward Defeat of President's Court Plan."

"Archbishop Curley Rebukes Msgr. Ryan for Court Attack."

"Italy Breeding Babies for War."

"'Let 'Em Eat Cake!' Bourbons' Answer to Public Cry for Bread."

"Facing Facts in Red Spain—This Is No 'Civil War,' Brutal Carnage Is All Part of World Revolt."

"Economist Declares a Few Bank Barons Bar Farm Progress."

"Living Costs Race Upward, Commodity Prices Climb as Bankers Raise Rates."

"Many Losing Homes to H.O.L.C. — 200,000 Marked for Foreclosure."

* * *

Because the value of these early copies has been enhanced by developments over the succeeding years, this department will review briefly each week some of the outstanding features of the contents of your SOCIAL JUSTICE five and six years ago.

Pete Reports Progress of Our Office Patient

HOWDY, FOLKS:

I gess we all got th' Spring feev'r a bit too erly. I'm stickin' clos' t' th' basmunt oil burn'r 'n my frens th' skwirruls 'r hidin' in their warm nests.

I don't get out t' pik up much noos but why shud I, my job's sirkalashun 'n it's up t' me t' remin' you that kupon's not down below here jus' t' fill up th' space. It's f'r y' t' USE 'n jes now that may meen YOU.

* * *

We hav' sum bad noos f'r ya here at th' offus, that is, it was bad, but it's gettin' bett'r evry minnut.

Mary May Schulte, th' pop'ler 'n efishunt sirkalashun 'n offus boss, hadda operashun.

She start'd hom' frum th' offus th' oth'r nite 'n didunt feel so good so she stopt in at a hospitul uv all places 'n before she cud say "what's-this" they had her on a operashun table 'n had that ol' 'pendix out.

I gess it all wuz jus' what th' dokt'r ordurd but it shure wuz a shock t' us 'n I gess it wuz t' May, too. She's gettin' along jus dandy now.

* * *

My bruther Pal tells me they gotta pashunt up at th' Shrine, too. Miss Beatrice Wilczynski, th' artust who paint'd all those beautiful altars that you folks hav' enjoyed on y'r visits t' Royal Oak, is down with noo-monya.

Pal's Boss said it'd be a good idee if you folks'd pray f'r her 'n Mary May.

Speakin' o' prayin'—are ya usin' th' Lenten Missul that we sent ya? Y' are? That's fine.

Gess that'll show Pal I cud be a rekt'ry maskot too if I hadda be, but I'm happy jus' as I am bein' y'r fren 'n gen'rul report'r 'n kinda takin' car' uv things f'r Mother 'n Dad Coughlin down here in th' woods.

Tak' care uv yerselfs 'n I'll see ya nex' wk.

—PETE

SUBSCRIPTION COUPON

Date.....

Name.....

Address.....

State..... Subscription rate $3 a year Renewal ☐ New ☐

(Remit by Check or Money Order)

SOCIAL JUSTICE PUBLISHING CO., Royal Oak, Michigan

Comment

An Analysis of the President's Speech

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S February 23rd speech did not find our Commander-in-Chief at his best. His tired vocal chords were racked by a hacking cough. He was disturbed by reason of (1) uninterrupted defeats, (2) the turn of events in China and India, (3) the pin-pricking of honest and dishonest critics, (4) the American labor front, and (5) other affairs which only his mind could reveal.

Naturally, conviction and persuasiveness were lacking in the words of the Chief Executive.

The purpose of the presidential address was obvious. Mr. Roosevelt, overwhelmed by criticism, appeared before the American public and the world to justify his choice of a military, naval and air strategy with which many Americans do not agree because it has produced nothing so far but a litany of reverses and promises of more.

Before we endeavor to analyze the substantial part of the presidential speech covering that justification, may we pause to approve its concluding paragraphs in which the Chief Executive pointed out the need for sacrifice on the part of all citizens. These paragraphs referred to labor, capital and the citizenry.

He said that labor must not stop work for a single day; that disputes between labor and capital will be solved by mediation or arbitration—until the war is won. As for capital, he said it should not demand special gains or special privileges. As for the citizenry at large, it was pointed out that we must give up conveniences and modify the routine of our lives if our country asks us to do so. For these observations the entire nation should thank our Commander-in-Chief as we follow him, critically or uncritically, to the end.

* * *

Let us now proceed in our analysis of the President's speech. The Chief Executive attempted to justify the adoption of a strategy which may be described as "fighting the enemy in the enemy's territories and waters." To this is opposed the strategy of forcing the enemy to fight us in our home territories and home waters with the expectancy that neither the Nazis nor Nipponese can hold permanently the temporary conquests they have made.

Mr. Roosevelt said: "We must all understand and face the hard fact that our job now is to fight at distances which extend all the way around the globe."

This World War did not begin December 7, 1941, as far as the United States is concerned. Long before the dastardly attack by the Japanese, the causes of war had been forged. Pearl Harbor was merely the occasion for our entrance into it. Over a period of many years the aggression of the British imperialists definitely had contributed to setting up the situation which resulted in war. Our decision to become the arsenal of democracy—more correctly, the arsenal for Great Britain in her efforts to maintain the imperial status quo—also had a great bearing upon the events which culminated in the Japanese attack. Whether this is admitted or denied, we now find ourselves assailed by mighty enemies who will not desist until they will have humbled us or we will have humbled them. Only a diplomatic miracle of the first water can stop the carnage now.

There are two strategies to pursue in the conduct of this war. One, we repeat, is to force the enemy to carry the war to us. This means that, perforce, the United Nations—particularly Britain—will withdraw from the inadequately defended Orient until such time as our ill-equipped forces can be supplied adequately with reserves, munitions, air power and ships. Then and not before then can the enemy be faced on an even basis and with hope of defeating them. Any contest we wage against the Nipponese before that time will result in the destruction of equipment and the futile loss of men.

Those who support this strategy also support the policy of preparing an unprepared America against invasion, instead of scattering our limited munitions and armaments throughout the world.

The other strategy—Mr. Roosevelt's—would have us carry the war to the enemies, waging it unpreparedly and with the inadequate armaments now at our disposal. It is this strategy which is now in operation. At the outset of this war Britain carried the offensive to Europe. That campaign ended at Dunkirk and Crete. Since Pearl Harbor both Britain and the United States elected to carry the war to the Orient. In less than ten weeks the United Nations lost Hong Kong, the Philippines, . . . Guam, Wake, Thailand, the Malayan Peninsula, Singapore, Sumatra, Borneo and other territories.

At this writing it appears that the British, Dutch and Americans will be forced to retreat from Burma and Java. Australia and New Zealand—almost 10,000 miles distant from the base of supplies—hold no substantial hope against invasion. If Batavia, Sidney and Melbourne fall—and it is likely they will—our efforts will have been expended in vain; for we will find ourselves without a first class naval or air base in that entire area.

* * *

Already this campaign has been costly in arms, munitions, men, territory, raw materials—and prestige. From the standpoint of our lost prestige, both India and China have suffered tremendously. Furthermore, neither of these vast nations can be counted on to render us any substantial help commensurate with their wealth and populations.

As a result of having followed this second strategy — Mr. Roosevelt's strategy — the shores of our homeland are not secure against aggression. Mighty units of the United Nations' fleets have been destroyed. The units of the Axis fleet soon may be amalgamated; soon may be strengthened by an addition of French ships. As matters stand at the moment there is a question as to whether the United Nations or the Axis powers hold supremacy on the seas. Definitely, in oriental waters, the Japanese hold the upper hand because they operate close to bases of supply while the United Nations' fleet—if Java falls—will be hard pressed for oil, munitions and airplane bases.

It was unfortunate that Mr. Roosevelt characterized the proponents of strategy number one as "those who still think in terms of the days of sailing ships." As a matter of fact, the proponents of strategy number one are those who think in terms of bombers and fighter planes; in terms of mechanized infantry and cavalry units, all of which depend upon oil and gasoline.

Upon these two commodities the progress of the war depends. With the fall of Java, the United Nations will be forced to import fuel and lubrication either from Iran and Iraq—doubtful sources of supply—or from the United States. We fear that Mr. Roosevelt and the advocates of strategy number two rely too presumptuously upon the potency of battleships. Mighty naval units are not to be disparaged. Nevertheless, they are inefficient when operating at great distances from the base of supplies and when unprotected by umbrellas of airplanes.

This observation has been corroborated in the instance of the *Prince of Wales* and the *Repulse* as well as in the tragedy of Pearl Harbor itself. It was again sustained by the battles of Crete and of the Straits of Dover.

Those who have reason to be alarmed because of apparent, if not real, unsoundness of strategy number two—Mr. Roosevelt's—are not appeasers when they recognize how futile it is for Britain and the United States, possessing between them approximately 12,000 airplanes, to attempt to send even 1,000 of them to the Philippines or Java. Had there been 500 airplanes at Singapore, the keystone to the British Empire would not have cracked. But apparently it was impossible to send them.

We do not agree with the President that the adoption of strategy number one is, as he terms it, a last ditch defense. No more

(Continued on Page 4)

Index to Comment

SOCIAL JUSTICE Six Years Old ..... Page 2

An Analysis of the President's Speech ..... Page 3

New Deal War Secrets Bill Would Be Tyranny; One Out of Every Three Men May Fight ..... Page 5

Editorials: Churchill vs. Roosevelt; Economic Parity With Canada Coming—How About Unity? ..... Page 6

Was Pension Bill a Trick to Disparage Congress? U. S. Lacks Ships for Offensive War ..... Page 7

Don't Hoard Cash; Reds Being Shielded?; F.B.I. Exonerated ..... Page 8

A Plea for 'More Democracy'; No Gain in War ..... Page 9

C.C.C. Under Fire — Recruiting Drive Accompanies Draft; A Farmer's Protest; Memo for F.D.R. ..... Page 10

Australia's Fate; Defense of Singapore; Lord Beaverbrook Retires; Churchill's Weak Moment ..... Page 11

Litvinov Tosses Out a Veiled Warning; Mr. Stimson Talking; 'Losing the War,' British Are Told ..... Page 13

Totalitarianism Forges Ahead in Great Britain; Sees English People Victims of Misrule ..... Page 15

Comment

(Continued from Page 3)

so than was Gene Tunney's bicycle race which enabled him to escape the flourishing fists of a furious Dempsey. You may recall the final outcome of that battle.

* * *

Mr. Roosevelt advised his audience to "look at your map." Briefly he skimmed over the face of the globe—rich in resources and raw materials and "of peoples determined to resist Axis domination."

Then he said: "It is obvious what would happen if all these great reservoirs of power were cut off from each other, either by enemy action or by self-imposed isolation."

The President's observations are correct. There are vast reservoirs of power. There are peoples determined to resist Axis domination. However, from these observations we deduce a conclusion which differs from the President's.

Asia is a reservoir of power. But, by no stretch of the imagination is all Asia capable of being tapped for the benefit of the United Nations in wartime. Even when Britain held the Malayan Peninsula it was not tapped to defend Singapore because the British feared to place guns in the hands of the natives.

British-held India is not tapped. The 350-million inhabitants of that economically enslaved territory want independence from Great Britain as much as they fear the aggressions of the Axis powers. A nondescript, ill-equipped and untrained army of no more than 500,000 has been raised by the 350-million inhabitants of India.

As a matter of fact, there already is grave danger of these reservoirs of power being cut off. The fall of Rangoon closes the Burma Road to China. The fall of Singapore renders precarious the use of the route through the Suez Canal and the Gulf of Aden by the British. The fall of Java will make it most difficult for the United Nations to cargo materials to Australia. In the present situation, it is almost hopeless to try to defeat the Japanese in oriental waters.

The President's fear as to what would happen if all these great reservoirs of power were cut off from each other were incorrectly related to the future. As a matter of fact, they are realities of the present. For all practical purposes they have been cut off.

Nevertheless the peoples of the isolated territories—particularly the Javanese and the Australians—are determined to resist Axis domination. Because this is so we can learn to be patient waiters on the platform of "watch and pray and produce" against the day when internal troubles will beset the Japanese in the Philippines, Malaya, Burma, Indo-China, Sumatra, Borneo, Java, Australia and India. As Hitler cannot control Europe by force of arms in a peacetime economy, so Japan cannot control Asia. Time is on our side if justice is on our side. Lacking justice, time will operate against us.

* * *

To support his strategy, Mr. Roosevelt pointed out what would happen if we imposed isolation, for the time being, upon ourselves. He said: "We could no longer send aid of any kind to China." With the fall of Rangoon it will not be possible to send any kind of adequate aid to China until a new road is built across India. This cannot be done in less than two to four years.

The President also said: "If we lost communication with the Southwest Pacific, all of that area, including Australia and New Zealand, would fall under Japanese domination." The communication with the Southwest Pacific, at present, is nothing to boast about. It is so fragile or nebulous that, up to date, we have not been able to send adequate aid to General MacArthur in the Philippines, a fact which the President admitted in his speech.

Meanwhile there is required of us approximately five times more tonnage to contact the Southwestern Pacific than is required of Japan. This is due to the tremendous distances which separate us from the seat of operations. At present, the tonnage is not available for us to compete with the Japanese.

To rationalize his strategy, the President intimated that if the Japanese knock out the Australian seaports and dominate them, thereby preventing materials arriving in the mainland, there is the possibility that the enemy will strike at the Western Hemisphere and Alaska.

Having expended all his argumentative force to justify the adoption of his strategy as far as the Orient is concerned, Mr. Roosevelt then turned his attention to the strategy of sending aid to the British and Russians. Said he: "If we were to stop sending munitions to the British and the Russians in the Mediterranean and Persian Gulf areas, we would help the Nazis to overrun Turkey, Syria, Iraq, Persia, Egypt and the Suez Canal, the whole coast of North Africa and the whole coast of West Africa—putting Germany within easy striking distance of South America."

Those who are critical of Mr. Roosevelt's strategy do not ask the President to cease sending munitions and war materials to the British and the Russians in "the Mediterranean and Persian Gulf areas." The President's opponents are concerned, for the major part, with the Orient. It behooves us, however, to recollect that the material we sent to Britain for use in the Mediterranean area has not been sufficient.

Hitler's Axis forces have gained the upper hand over the British on every front and promise to make a break-through by way of Iran and Iraq this spring. The help we have been sending to the Russians has fallen below the expectancy entertained by the Kremlin.

Thus, by the Fourth of July, after we will have exerted every effort to send more and more aid both to Stalin and to Churchill; after we will have denuded ourselves of planes, anti-aircraft guns, tanks and other war needs, the entire world will know whether or not Mr. Roosevelt's viewpoint was correct as far as Britain and Russia are concerned. By that date, probably, Hitler will have driven the British from the Mediterranean or he will never drive them from that territory. If Hitler succeeds in doing so, isolationism will be forced upon us at a time when our war materials, including airplanes, munitions and tanks, will have been dissipated abroad. Then we will be forced to begin to think of America first. Then, after Australian occupation by the Japanese, we will be unprepared to meet the forces of the invaders.

* * * *

To our mind, it appears that Hitler will achieve his African objective. The British can't stop him as long as they retain approximately 3-million armed soldiers in England; as long as Field Marshal Rommel, with a small force, can hold the British at bay in Libya. With Nazi troops pouring in from the east and with Rommel's troops pushing from the west, the British cause and the Suez Canal appear to be doomed in Africa.

All in all, those who prefer strategy number one to strategy number two—the President's strategy—are those who have confidence in the integrity of the nations overrun by the Axis powers. We admit we have little confidence in the loyalty of the Malayans and Indians towards the cause of the United Nations because they never enjoyed being economic slaves of Great Britain.

On the contrary, we entertain a world of confidence in the Europeans, the South Americans, the North Africans and others who will never submit graciously to the policies of a world-wide Axis government.

If Hitler proposes to police Europe after having imposed his way of life upon all Europeans, his efforts will be nullified within a period of ten years. No nation can police the world without becoming hated by the world; without amalgamating the world against itself. On that principle we rely. Thus, time is not only the healer of wounds; it is also the solvent of unjust aggression. Incidentally it appears that Britain inclines towards this policy insofar as she takes care of England first—and the colonies afterwards.

* * *

The President disclosed that we are maintaining four main lines of communication across the several oceans and seas. In conjunction with this he indicated that our ships are carrying troops and munitions outbound; and essential raw materials inbound. This was an interesting piece of information because it revealed to us that an effort is being made to send American soldiers to Australia where the United Nations hope to make their last stand in the Orient.

In this connection the President confessed that the maintenance of the trade lanes depended upon supremacy of air power. But he reluctantly pointed out that it is easier for the Japanese to maintain efficient air power in the Orient than it is for us because smaller airplanes cannot fly from San Francisco to the Philippines nor to Australia. These must be cargoed in ships convoyed by men of war and preyed upon by enemy submarines and bombers. Our enemy, on the contrary, can fly both large and small planes all over the Orient due to the fact that a plenitude of landing places is in his possession. Although America has many planes active in the theater of the East Indian war, events have proven their number inadequate.

All in all, it is difficult for us to applaud the policy of strategy number two — Mr. Roosevelt's. The President himself seems to impugn the efficacy of his own strategy as far as the Orient is concerned when he says: "It is that complete encirclement, with control of the air by Japanese land-based aircraft, which has prevented us from sending substantial reinforcements of men and material to the gallant defenders of the Philippines."

If the Japanese can prevent our sending substantial reinforcements to MacArthur, definitely they can prevent our sending adequate armaments for the defense of Java and Australia. Therefore, the President himself contributed by his own words the

(Continued on Page 14)

New Deal War Secrets Bill Would Be Tyranny

Measure Sponsored by Administration to Cover Up Inefficiency

THE WHOLE question of censorship in wartime is being reviewed in committee hearings on the proposed *War Secrets Bill.*

The chief objection to the measure is not that newspapers or the public wish access to Government secrets, but the very reasonable suspicion that certain bureaucratic officials, particularly the Leftists, intend to use censorship to escape criticism for inefficiency—or worse.

That, indeed, is the chief objection to all censorship. Down through the years, this vicious power, usually granted for an emergency, has been used as often to keep the people from learning about the bungling of their own officials as to deceive an enemy in wartime.

It is under the protection of such secrecy controls that dictatorships invariably march to power.

If the people of this Republic are to forego their American standard of living for some as-yet-vague free "way of life"; if our boys are to give all, and our taxpayers to do likewise—they are going to have little patience with official ineptitude and none at all with downright rascality.

Concealment of questionable official conduct under the guise of wartime censorship will not be tolerated in this country.

Pearl Harbor is an example of what the people mean.

* * *

Drafted by Attorney General Biddle and introduced in Congress by Senator Frederick Van Nuys, Indiana Democrat, the controversial *War Secrets Bill* would impose a fine of $5,000 and two years' imprisonment upon any person who wilfully divulges "the purport, effect or meaning of" any "file, instrument, letter, memorandum, book, pamphlet, paper, document, manuscript, map, picture, plan, record, or other writing" which might be *declared to be secret by any rule or regulation of any Government agency.*

The vicious opportunities in that language are not even subtle—they're obvious. Any bureaucrat suspected of inefficiency, stupidity or rascality, could protect himself from exposure or investigation simply by issuing a regulation defining the evidence against him an official "secret."

Never before in the history of government — not even in the Bolshevik Soviet Union; not even in Nazi Germany — has there been such a planned assault against freedom of speech and freedom of knowledge, as is blueprinted in this bill.

No measure presented to Congress by the New Deal Administration since the United States entered the war has aroused such bitter opposition so quickly. Even Senator Van Nuys has been forced to disclaim paternity of it.

The Indiana Senator declared, "the language of that bill is so broad that it would be possible for them to impound every public document, and I doubt whether the Senate itself could subpoena documents declared by the head of a Government agency to be confidential."

Like many New Deal bills, this measure is presented as a wolf dressed in the sheep's clothing of war emergency. While, externally, it has the laudable purpose of preventing military information from seeping into the hands of the enemy, it is couched in communistic terms that would make Josef Stalin and his agents appear to be complete conservatives!

In the present state of affairs in wartime Washington, what with even unintentional confusion and inefficiency, this secrecy bill would just about "tear the whole works," as one correspondent puts it.

* * *

Senator Gillette of Iowa, author of a resolution to investigate industrial alcohol and synthetic rubber, said that any such investigation "could be very effectively stymied" by the proposed *War Secrets Bill.*

Senator Truman, chairman of the Senate's special defense investigation committee, said it "might as well close up shop and go home" if the secrets bill were passed.

Other Congressional investigations, such as the Byrd committee on non-essential Federal expenditures, the Tydings committee on Government efficiency for war purposes and the Dies committee on subversive activities, all would be wrecked.

Senator Ball of Minnesota said the bill would "permit a censorship in this country as bad and inimical to the public interest as anything in Nazi Germany!"

There is not much likelihood that the bill will emerge from the committee to be passed as written by the Government. The Attorney General, appearing before the Senate Judiciary Committee hearing, admitted the possibilities of its misuse by dishonest bureaucrats, and agreed to Congressional limitations of its provisions to the records of Government departments.

* * *

Editorial comment on the proposal is universally condemnatory and nobody in Washington expects the measure to come out of committee without drastic alterations and safeguards for the American people.

Frank R. Kent, the *Baltimore Sun's* political commentator, observes that the *War Secrets Bill* had been "accompanied by editorials from left-wing Administration organs, the gist of which is that *war sanctifies the President and any criticism now of any Roosevelt act is equivalent to treason.* The combination of this bill and the editorials seems more than a coincidence."

Arthur Krock, in the *New York Times,* characterized the Biddle bill as "an invitation to tyranny," in that it would install a censorship such as has not been dreamed of before.

The stranglehold which the Government already has on the radio is such that no radio commentator—who wants to last as one—can be really frank in dealing with Administration shortcomings, Mr. Kent observes.

"It took more than a year of newspaper pounding before the President was forced to do what he should have done in the first place — delegate power to one man and make him boss of production," says the *Baltimore Sun.*

"But for the newspapers, the unsavory mess of O.C.D., which had become a well-paid haven for Mrs. Roosevelt's proteges and uplift friends, would never have been revealed.

And the *Chicago Tribune* asserts boldly:

"This is an attempt to protect the grafters, fellow travelers, and wasters in the New Deal from exposure by placing a gag on their critics. That can be its only purpose, for the censorship and the *Espionage Act* already provide sufficient protection against the disclosure of any confidential material that might harm our national defense . . .

"The affairs and transactions of Government should at all times be subjected to the closest public scrutiny. In attempting to give bureaucrats the right to say what shall and shall not be published concerning their activities Mr. Biddle is seeking to transform the servants of the people into their masters."

A *Washington Post* editorial says: "What is chiefly disturbing about the bill is the fact that a member of the Cabinet would sponsor a potential assault upon democratic practices at a time when the country needs to mobilize all its energy to fight the Japo-Nazi system abroad."

* * *

Behind the writing of the bill one sees the fine, conniving hand of a group whose members are most allergic to criticism, however well-founded.

It's not always what Mr. Roosevelt accomplishes, but sometimes what he tries to accomplish which offers us a gage of his ability to conduct this nation through a crisis.

However, he is trying to make the world safe for "democracy" by beginning with America.

One Out of Every Three Men May Fight

NINE MILLION MEN recently were registered for military service.

The question is, what demands will Government make on these 9-million and the 17-million previous registrants.

How fast will these 26-million men be called from their jobs to fight?

What should families and employers expect in their homes and factories?

The *Wall Street Journal* concedes that many peacetime industries must go by the board.

Editors throughout the country foresee the conscription of women for such work as gardening, taxi-driving, barbering, etc.

We reprint a more specific answer to the above question from the *Wall Street Journal* which says:

The call for men to join the Army and Navy won't take many husbands or fathers during this year. It won't take many skilled workers. Fighting men of 1942 will be drawn primarily from those men already tagged as eligible for service and from the 20-year-olds . . . Next year may be a very different story.

About 2¼ million men will join the

(Continued on Page 18)

NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Published by The Social Justice Publishing Co.

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

Churchill vs. Roosevelt

FOLLOWING the President's "apologia pro vita sua"— his attempt to rationalize his conduct in the U.S.-Jap war—speculation was rife as to the present relations between him and Winston Churchill.

At the Atlantic Charter conference these gentlemen buddied on the deck of the *Prince of Wales*. At a later date they fraternized most amicably at the White House. On both occasions plans were discussed, pledges were made and decisions agreed upon.

Eventually, Mr. Churchill returned to his House of Commons, there to defend himself and his policies following a series of British defeats. To his everlasting credit Mr. Churchill—whose name, like the Hope Diamond, has been associated with disaster—blamed no subordinate, no officer, no admiral, no general, for the bungling, the complacency and ill-starred fortune which characterize the current history of Britain. Manfully, Mr. Churchill bared his breast —and his conscience—and accepted all the blame.

Following Pearl Harbor, Mr. Roosevelt disagreed with Mr. Churchill's breast-baring policy to the extent that Admiral Kimmel and General Short were designated to be the Scriptural goats on whose backs were heaped the sins of the Administration.

At a later date, the Administration blamed the people directly for the complacency so widespread in our nation, and indirectly for our defeats.

* * *

Thus, the two great Allied leaders—Churchill and Roosevelt—began to manifest divergent characteristics—characteristics which, in the alembic of time, can not stand together.

Although Churchill is disaster's darling, yet he is no mincer of words. Therefore, the world was not surprised to hear fall from his lips two most significant statements. The first was that his main objective throughout his term in office as Prime Minister was to get the United States into a shooting war with its manpower. The second was volcanic in its results, as far as the American public is concerned, for he said that at the Atlantic Conference Mr. Roosevelt led him to hope the United States would get into war on the Pacific front whether or not the Americans were attacked by the enemy.

These two statements left Mr. Roosevelt in a perilous position. Consider that our leader publicly pledged again and again that he would not lead this country into war—unless attacked. He cannot help but regard Mr. Churchill, therefore, as an ultra-clever diplomat whose words nullified the promises and pledges made by Mr. Roosevelt to America.

Some will interpose at this juncture to say that Mr. Churchill practiced deceit when, previously, he said he did not want American manpower in this war. His language at that time was most concise. Upon analysis, it can be construed to mean that he did not want American manpower in the war *at the time he was speaking.*

As for the second Churchillian statement, it leaves Mr. Roosevelt with the urgent necessity confronting him of forcing the British Prime Minister to clarify his statement concerning the Pacific war.

If we know Churchill, he will be adamant. If we know Roosevelt, he will not take this "fifth-columnizing" disclosure in the best of grace. Does it mean that the pals are about to part? Time alone can tell.

Economic Parity With Canada Coming; How About Unity?

LONG BEFORE Pearl Harbor, SOCIAL JUSTICE predicted there would be an economic parity between the United States and Canada. The simplest, but not complete, way of translating this is to say that the Canadian and the American dollars will be at par.

We made our prediction when the first rumors of the Lend-Lease Bill were circulated in the corridors of Washington. We concluded that if the United States became not only the arsenal but also the bank of democracy, it would require only a short time for our per capita debt to be on a par with the Canadian per capita debt.

Moreover, when it was evident to every honest person that we would be engaged in a shooting war that would last, probably, for eight years, it appeared to us that our per capita debt might surpass that of the Canadians and that, consequently, their dollar would be more valuable than ours.

Now comes *Business Week*—one of the finest weekly magazines published in America—to add to our argument.

Business Week says:

"Canada's most popular and persistent rumor—that the Canadian dollar will be pulled up from its present 89c value to full equality with the United States dollar and pegged there—popped up again this week. In Ottawa corridors it was whispered that negotiations to accomplish this already were under way, but neither New York nor Washington would confirm this report.

"Canadians insist that there is more reason to expect the move now than there has been in the past. The two economics gradually are being integrated. Exports to the United States are up. Imports are down, for despite the big demand for steel and airplane engines, Canada's curtailment of consumer-goods imports more than balances the increase.

"Only two groups in the Dominion were unhappy with revival of the rumor—the newsprint and gold-mining industries. Both have been profiting handsomely by the 11% premium on sales in the United States."

* * *

World War II will force continental solidarity in America. Perhaps it will not be a political solidarity, but definitely it will be economic. This will eventuate whether or not the United Nations win World War II.

The sooner the economic barriers are broken down between the United States and Canada, the better for all concerned—for all except the newsprint and gold-mining industries operating in Canada.

After all, the Canadian people are more than cousins of the American people. In common we speak the same language and possess, in theory, the same ideals. If anything, the Canadians are a more conservative people than we. And unquestionably, they are a more religious people, possessing a higher standard of morals.

The World War has brought us closer together. If there is anything to a union of nations, let us begin by uniting with a nation who is our neighbor, our friend and our blood relative.

There is the element of danger in that the Orientals, if they are victorious, will cast envious eyes at America. Let America, beginning with the United States and Canada, consolidate its natural wealth, its economic resources and its money. Together we can stand against the world. Divided, we will fall a prey to the invader.

While on this subject of economic parity and consolidation, let us look south of the Rio Grande as far as the Panama Canal.

The backward Chinese were modern enough to build a road from Rangoon, through Burma, into China proper. We have been so modern that we were backward in not building a road from Texas to the Panama Canal. When will this necessary operation be reduced from blueprint to actuality? Such a highway is necessary to complete the consolidation of this continent and to protect the vital break-through point of the Panama Canal.

Was Pension Bill 'Trick' To Disparage Congress?

WAS THE so-called Congressional pension grab a political trick designed to make Congress still more unpopular with the people, in a year when one-third of the Senate and all the Members of the House must come before the voters for election?

The bill granting annuities for Congressmen and high Government officials was made part of a measure increasing retirement benefits for regular Federal civil service employes.

It was slipped through the House on December 1st, on unanimous consent — without a record vote—with few members present.

It was quickly approved by the Senate —42 to 24—on January 19th.

Not until later was it learned that President Roosevelt, whose signature made the bill law, was himself also eligible for a life income ($37,000 a year) from the Government under its terms.

Although the pension bill would "take care of" New Deal appointees, in danger of dislodgment in the event non-essential "political" bureaus were curtailed or abolished during wartime, the opprobrium and public resentment were all centered upon Congress.

Newspapers spoke of the bill as "pensions for Congressmen" and public criticism, certainly, centered upon the Representatives and Senators who must face the electorate for a "vote of confidence" in November.

Indeed, there is some question whether prompt repeal of the pension bill can offset the resentment kindled by the "sneak" method of its enactment. If Congress was the "victim" of any political plot, its supine willingness to lend itself to the scheme most certainly played right into the hands of the enemies of the Republic.

* * *

The first official recognition of the whole thing as an Administration measure came in Senate debate over repeal.

Majority Leader Alben Barkley, Kentucky Democrat and the Administration's mouthpiece in the Senate, demanded immediate action to remove the bill from the books.

Whereupon Senator William J. Bulow of South Dakota, also a Democrat, and chairman of the Senate Civil Service Committee, let the cat out of the sack.

"Personally, I do not see why the distinguished leader should be in such a hurry," demurred Senator Bulow; "I have not heard of any Representative or Senator who is contemplating to resign in order to go on the retirement list.

"Let me say that this was *an Administration measure!* I hesitated to introduce it for quite a while. But ***the request came from the Administration!***

"It was passed by a substantial majority of the Senate. It was signed by the President. I cannot see why our leader should get so excited about it."

Senator Barkley hastened to deny that he was any more "excited" than Senator Bulow, or that the pension grab was an "Administration measure."

"I am not excited about it, any more than the Senator from South Dakota is excited," said Senator Barkley. "In reply to his suggestion that this was an 'Administration measure' I would at least correct him to the extent that the provision covering congressional pensions certainly was not an Administration measure. It originated in and passed the House."

Representative Robert Ramspeck, Georgia Democrat, was the pension bill's original sponsor.

Senator Barkley continued:

"I have no recollection that any recommendation by the President, or anybody else in the Administration, ever contemplated the inclusion of Members of Congress in the *Retirement Act*. To that extent I think it is not quite accurate to say that it was an Administration measure."

* * *

The *St. Louis Post-Dispatch* makes a genuine contribution to the controversy by breaking down the Senate vote on both the original proposal and the repeal.

"It is not enough to know that the Senate yielded to public opinion and reversed itself under fire on the congressional pension," observes the editorial.

"It is not enough to know that after approving the pension 42 to 24, our Senators turned around and rejected it 75 to 5.

"Every voter in the country is entitled to know how the Senators from his state stood on each roll call."

In this situation it is the United States Senate that "takes the rap"— the House members having been politically clever enough to avoid a record vote on the original proposal. The House vote on the matter of repeal, as that in the Senate for that matter, merely reflects congressional reaction to the public whirlwind of condemnation.

The *Post-Dispatch* compiled a table of the Senate vote from the *Congressional Record* report of the first roll call and the Associated Press report of the repeal vote. It is an interesting study: voters of America should—as the *Post-Dispatch* intimates—paste it in their hats.

Here is the record of the 96 Senators, as presented by the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*:

FOR THE PENSION BOTH TIMES—4

LaFollette (P) Wis.	Nye (R) N. D.
Mead (D) N. Y.	Wallgren (D) Wash.

AGAINST THE PENSION BOTH TIMES—24

Brewster (R) Maine	Lodge (R) Mass.
Burton (R) Ohio	Lucas (D) Ill.
Butler (R) Neb.	McKellar (D) Tenn.
Byrd (D) Va.	Maybank (D) S. C.
Chandler (D) Ky.	Millikin (R) Colo.
Connally (D) Texas	Norris (Ind.) Neb.
Danaher (R) Conn.	Radcliffe (D) Md.
Ellender (D) La.	Taft (R) Ohio
Gerry (D) R. I.	Tydings (D) Md.
Green (D) R. I.	Vandenberg (R) Mich.
Gurney (R) S. D.	Wiley (R) Wis.
Johnson (D) Colo.	Willis (R) Ind.

REVERSED THEMSELVES—31

Aiken (R) Vt.	Holman (R) Ore.
Austin (R) Vt.	Hughes (D) Dela.
Bankhead (D) Ala.	Kilgore (D) W. Va.
Bilbo (D) Miss.	Lee (D) Okla.
Bone (D) Wash.	McFarland (D) Ariz.
Brown (D) Mich.	Maloney (D) Conn.
Bulow (D) S. D.	Murray (D) Mont.
Bunker (D) Nev.	Rosier (D) W. Va.
*Capper (R) Kan.	Smathers (D) N. J.
Caraway (D) Ark.	Stewart (D) Tenn.
Davis (R) Pa.	Tobey (R) N. H.
Doxey (D) Miss.	Truman (D) Mo.
George (D) Ga.	Tunnell (D) Del.
Gillette (D) Ia.	Wheeler (D) Mont.
Hayden (D) Ariz.	White (R) Maine
Hill (D) Ala.	

*Although Senator Capper voted for the pension the first time, he later explained that he did so without knowing what it provided. He promptly sent a letter to President Roosevelt calling on him to veto the bill. The President, however, signed it.

NOT VOTING FIRST TIME, AGAINST PENSION SECOND TIME—27

Bailey (D) N. C.	McCarran (D) Nev.
Ball (R) Minn.	McNary (R) Ore.
Barbour (R) N. J.	Murdock (D) Utah
Barkley (D) Ky.	O'Daniel (D) Texas
Bridges (R) N. H.	O'Mahoney (D) Wyo.
Brooks (R) Ill.	Overton (D) La.
Chavez (D) N. M.	Reed (R) Kan.
Clark (D) Mo.	Russell (D) Ga.
Downey (D) Calif.	Schwartz (D) Wyo.
Glass (D) Va.	Thomas (R) Idaho
Hatch (D) N. M.	Thomas (D) Okla.
Herring (D) Ia.	Van Nuys (D) Ind.
Johnson (R) Calif.	Walsh (D) Mass.
Langer (R) N. D.	

FOR PENSION FIRST TIME, NOT VOTING SECOND TIME—7

Guffey (D) Pa.	Smith (D) S. C.
Pepper (D) Fla.	Thomas (D) Utah
Reynolds (D) N. C.	Wagner (D) N. Y.
Shipstead (F-L) Minn.	

NOT VOTING FIRST TIME, FOR PENSION SECOND TIME—1

Clark (D) Idaho

NOT VOTING EITHER TIME—2

Andrews (D) Fla.	Spencer (D) Ark.

U. S. Lacks Ships For Offensive War

ALTHOUGH the problem of war production may be solved and labor may be regimented, we are faced with the unpleasant fact that victory depends not only on tanks, cannon, munitions and airplanes but on ships.

Not warships, if you please, but fast-moving freighters.

Mr. Roosevelt has elected to pursue a policy of fighting the enemy in his own territory. Already our Oriental enemies are in a fair way to capture or harass all lands and islands bordering on or adjacent to the Indian Ocean and the branches thereof.

In plainer words, the Japanese control the Pacific Ocean, for the most part, west of the Hawaiian Islands.

To pursue an offensive war against the Japanese, it will be necessary for us to cargo our fighting units and all necessary supplies half-way around the world.

It is estimated by experts that 100 tons of cargo bottoms are required to sustain one man.

At present we lack the ships to launch

(Continued on Page 18)

Comment

Don't Hoard Cash

THE SERIES of setbacks suffered by the United Nations will have peculiar effects not only upon business, civilian life and personal liberties but also upon each individual's pocketbook.

It is obvious that we must produce more war material and less peacetime material. Undoubtedly, the Government will see that this is accomplished. Radios, washing machines, oil burners, domestic equipment and a thousand other items will suffer a blackout for the duration. The factories and hands now employed in their manufacture will be converted into armament and munition industries.

Investors in stocks of mass production corporations such as Chrysler, General Motors, duPont, etc., already recognize that there will be a sharp decline in dividends because Government cannot go on permitting these corporations to make excessive profits even though a corporation tax of 75 or 80 per cent must be imposed upon such concerns.

Business men find themselves living in a new world. The hundreds of thousands of automotive dealers were prioritied out of existence. Grocers soon will be rationing sugar and other commodities. Merchants, in general, will be told not only what to sell but what to charge.

All this will have a bearing on your pocketbook—even though you are inclined, erroneously, to hoard hard cash.

From reliable reports it appears that too many of our citizens are inviting unnecessary trouble for themselves and neighbors by hoarding cash. It seems that some persons have been drawing money from savings banks and stowing it away in cellar hiding places. They are operating under the false theory that the smart policy to pursue is to have cash in hand—keeping it out of circulation, investments or banks.

Unfortunately, as we warned you in a previous issue, that is a very unsafe policy. Some citizens have adopted this practice because they think there will be a Government tax on bank deposits. Others are acting under the fear that the banks will fail. Still others, with an eye on inflation, believe that the best defense against inflation is cash in hand.

* * *

All these fears are vain—even though they come to pass.

Supposing the Government does tax bank deposits, it will not be an overburdening tax.

Supposing some banks will fail, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation will take care of the majority of depositors.

Supposing inflation will come, cash in hand immediately loses some of its value.

But supposing more and more citizens persist in withdrawing their money from banks and hoarding it in secret hiding places, we warn you as we warned you before that the Government may be forced to call in all outstanding bills. Here is what probably will occur if the Government is forced to take such action:

(1) The money a citizen has in hoarding will be fished from cellar hideaways and taken to a bank for redemption in the new currency.

(2) The banker, at the command of Government, will report carefully how much money the hoarder traded.

(3) A Treasury tax will be imposed upon all citizens to take care of the cost of this entire transaction.

(4) Any hoarder who does not turn in his money will find himself possessing an abundance of pre-war wallpaper.

Therefore, what will you do with your money? The brief answer is, do not hoard it.

(a) Place it in a reputable bank.

(b) Deposit it in Postal Savings.

(c) Buy yourself necessary commodities such as clothing, bedding, etc.

(d) Invest in Government certificates, or bonds.

(e) Invest in a fair piece of real estate at a fair price.

There has been a steady rise in the amount of currency in circulation. This is due not altogether to the fact that there is an actual rise in circulated currency but to the fact that the Government is forced to issue more money in the form of Federal Reserve Notes because too many of our citizens are hiding their money and holding it out of circulation. All this will point toward inflation if and when the hidden money joins up with the unhidden money in the national flow of currency.

After all, what is your money? All bills from $10 up are now Federal Reserve Notes. Many of our $5 bills are Federal Reserve Notes. These notes are promises to pay and represent a debt we taxpayers owe the Federal Reserve Bank.

Therefore, do not force the Government to order the Federal Reserve Banks to issue more notes.

On the other hand, do not be imprudent and buy things you do not want or cannot manage.

This commentator, for example, should not buy a farm because he does not know the first thing about managing a farm.

Be sensible.

Be prudent.

Be calm.

Reds Being Shielded?

MRS. EVALYN WALSH MCLEAN has been nominated by certain radicals as America's Lady Astor. It was she who was castigated publicly but indirectly by high officials. It was her mansion at Washington which was designated as the rendezvous for appeasers, pro-Nazis, fifth columnists and what-not.

Mrs. Evalyn Walsh McLean long has been famous as one of Washington's most famous hostesses and the owner of the ill-fated Hope Diamond.

Recently, she sought the arrest of Richard Bransten, alias Bruce Minton, the Washington editor of the communistic *New Masses*, because this publication defined Mrs. McLean's residence as the headquarters of the Cliveden set.

The article in the *New Masses* was published the day following Mr. Roosevelt's denunciation of the so-called Cliveden group. According to the *Chicago Tribune* (Feb. 21) this fact aroused conjecture that Mr. Roosevelt had seen an advance copy of the article which contained the names of 21 prominent officials and society figures composing the alleged Cliveden group.

Therein lies the story of the criminal libel proceedings which Mrs. McLean initiated unsuccessfully.

Because she could not secure a warrant for the arrest of the Red editor, she accused the Department of Justice of shielding him.

Mrs. McLean cited the District of Columbia law which holds that the publisher of a libel may be punished by imprisonment up to five years and a fine up to $1,000.

She also reported that the Department of Justice, in denying the warrant, said that it would be a bad policy to issue one.

There are many Communists, according to Martin Dies, in Government and on the public payroll.

Those who opposed Communism either abroad or at home cannot expect to be smiled upon by all departments of the Administration. For the duration—if not after—such persons will not be pleasing to the powers that be.

Farmers Are Angry

THREAT of an agricultural labor shortage would be worse but for the fact that mechanization has upped farm production per man by 30 per cent since the first World War. However, farmers are boiling mad about draft deferments for movie folk and labor leaders while their own sons and hired help go to war.

F.B.I. Exonerated

THE House Appropriations Committee revealed recently that the Federal Bureau of Investigation provided vital information to the Army and Navy in Hawaii in ample time to have been of valuable assistance in combating the Japanese.

For this information the American public is grateful, in so far as radicals in high and low positions have been attempting to blame the catastrophe of Pearl Harbor on J. Edgar Hoover and his organization.

Although the House Committee did not amplify its statement with concrete proof relative to the F.B.I. and Hawaii, the following statement was issued to the public:

"From the facts supplied to the committee by the director of the bureau," the report said, "it would appear that the primary responsibility for investigation of subversive activity in Hawaii did not rest upon the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

"In spite of the fact, however, that they were not charged directly with that responsibility, it would appear that the agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation were entirely diligent in the matter of obtaining vital information which was placed in the hands of the responsible military and naval authorities in ample time to have been of most valuable assistance had it been heeded.

"The committee desires to commend Director Hoover and his organization for the alertness that was displayed by them even in the face of the fact that the primary responsibility was not on their doorstep."

Comment

A Plea for 'More Democracy'

A MORE "responsive system of Government" which would permit the removal of an American President, just as the British democracy can remove a Prime Minister, is set forth as a wartime need by Henry Hazlitt, an editorial writer for the *New York Times* (Feb. 8). A reprint of the article appears in the space usually given to David Lawrence's editorial comment in *The United States News* (Feb. 27).

"If the President and Congress disagree, there is a deadlock. Neither can appeal from the verdict of the other to that of the country," Mr. Hazlitt objects.

"Congress cannot force the resignation of the President, as the British Parliament can that of the Prime Minister, by voting a lack of confidence.

"The President, on his side, cannot force Congress to adopt a policy he considers vital by dissolving Congress and appealing from its verdict to that of the country.

"Congress can prevent the President from doing as he wishes; but cannot make him do what it wishes. Responsibility is divided and lost even within Congress itself . . .

"The result of this system, even in quiet times, as Bryce pointed out, is that 'the nation does not always know how or where to fix responsibility for misfeasance or neglect,' and 'no one acts under the full sense of direct accountability.'

"Under our inflexible system," objects Mr. Hazlitt, "no issue can be taken to the country when it is urgent and uppermost. It must wait for settlement until an election date comes around, two, four or six years later.

"Imagine what the result would be if we chose our military leaders in the field on such a principle," he says. "Our Commander-in-Chief, and the members of Congress who together are responsible for our economic, industrial and political organization for war, and for the conduct of its grand strategy, and who choose and remove the military commanders in the field, are themselves selected for precisely such rigidly fixed periods, with no constitutional method by which the people can change them, or bring them into account, except at the end of their fixed terms.

"When there is a disaster like Pearl Harbor, almost the sole responsibility is fixed on the local commanders, who can be removed . . . But the responsibility of the Administration itself for appointing precisely these commanders . . . failed to receive the attention in the Roberts commission report that it surely deserved.

* * *

"Mr. Churchill is forced constantly to explain and defend his acts and decisions to the country, because if at any time he fails to do this satisfactorily he can be forced to resign, as Mr. Chamberlain was before him.

"In this country, criticism of the President is comparatively muted and indirect, chiefly for a reason that should be obvious. There is no constitutional way in which the President, if he fails to conduct the war in a manner satisfactory to the country, can be forced to resign and yield to another choice."

As long as this rigid constitutional system lasts, continues the *New York Times* writer, the Presidential incumbent is "our President for better or for worse until the next Presidential election day rolls round nearly three years hence.

"Meanwhile, sharp criticism of the President, even if factually justified, is felt to be not merely futile but possibly dangerous, because as long as we have this constitutional rigidity there is latent fear that such criticism may divide the country without bringing nearer the reforms that are urged.

"The same sense of futility and possible danger discourages sharp criticism of Congress . . . The President cannot threaten to dissolve a recalcitrant Congress that refuses to take vitally necessary measures in time. The people cannot recall its (Congress') members.

* * *

"Our *Constitution* at the time it was adopted was a document far in advance of its age. Even today, there could be no nobler statement of part of our war aims than one particular part of that *Constitution*, the *Bill of Rights*. But that part of our *Constitution* which deals with the mere machinery of Government must now be candidly re-examined in the light of the present crisis.

"The *Constitution* exists for the country, not the country for the *Constitution*," the *Times* editor asserts, and cautions: "We must not make a fetish of a rigid legal document.

"We cannot permit ourselves to lose this war, or even to prolong this war, merely because we have become too hidebound to re-examine and to change that document.

"We must be at least as ready to make progressive changes in Government as our forefathers were when they framed that document . . .

"What are the alterations in our *Constitution* that experience has suggested—that experience has shown, indeed, to be now imperative? It is not difficult to draw their main outlines. The Government *must be responsible and accountable at all times to the people!*

"This means that the people must have potential control of their Government at all times, and not simply at rigid election dates two or four years apart. The people must have the power, in short, to change their Government at any time, and, if necessary, to change it completely!

"To make this practically possible, Congress should have power at any time to vote a lack of confidence in the President, who would then have the choice of resigning or of dissolving Congress. In the latter case, he would force every member of Congress to go to the country for re-election, and himself to stand for such re-election.

"If the President won the country's verdict, he would get a Congress pledged to support him; if he lost it, the new Congress could itself pick a new leader."

* * *

Now, despite the New Deal record of domestic failure to achieve recovery, a policy of international "meddling;" of costly inefficiency, bungling and spending, the voter-following reputed to be behind the President is still enough to frighten Congress.

Congressmen standing for re-election in November fear to oppose the President because they fear this voters' power which the President still holds in spite of everything. They fear it will be used against them on the old "purge" basis. And, war has heightened rather than dissipated this political fear.

Three successive terms in office—in the face of the New Deal domestic record and its declared foreign policies—give some color of substance to the Congressional fears.

Mr. Hazlitt continues with some interesting arguments to support his theme:

"The merit of a constitutional system of this sort," he says, "is not merely that it would empower the people to remove their leaders at any time these proved unable to carry out the national will. The mere existence of such a power on the part of the people," he believes, "would also have a salutary effect on the responsiveness to the national will of those leaders already in office.

"It would tend equally to make the existing opposition party in Congress more responsible in its opposition, and force it to become positive rather than merely obstructive in its program. For the effectiveness of this opposition would depend upon its ability to convince the country that it was a conceivable alternative to the existing administration and that it was fit to govern."

The *New York Times* writer concludes:

"Such a thoroughgoing revision of our *Constitution* has now become imperative if we are to meet today's terribly urgent problems . . . To make our *Constitution* flexible is as important to winning the war as price controls, priorities, taxes and many other essential measures . . .

"The only true democracy is one that allows the people to change their government the moment they find it necessary to do so—and above all, to change it in a crisis."

(Continued on Page 11)

No Gain in War

"NO GREATER delusion can be entertained than the hope that a country or its citizens can secure lasting material benefits from war, which is a waste and destruction of materials, labor and capital."

This utterance, oddly enough, is not that of a clergyman, but of a Canadian banker addressing an annual stockholders' meeting.

A Montreal dispatch of the Canadian press quotes Mr. Beaudry Leman before the annual meeting of the Banque Canadienne Nationale as follows:

"As the State runs into debt it appropriates through taxation the products of the toil of its nationals. Deficit spending and borrowing have their limits that are to be found along the border line separating production of a country and the minimum to which consumption may be reduced.

"Sooner or later the cost of the war must be reduced. Sooner or later the cost of the war must be paid for in toil and self-denial. The imposts which have been mounting since the beginning of hostilities now bear so heavily on the taxpayer that he is deprived of a large share of his toil, of his savings and his initiative.

"What measure of economic freedom will the post-war world enjoy? The democracies have been compelled for the sake of speed and efficiency to adopt methods which are part and parcel of the totalitarian philosophy.

"Will these restraining measures become permanent or will governments loosen their hold on all forms of economic activity?"

Comment

C.C.C. Under Fire; Recruiting Drive Accompanies Draft

A NEW period of recruitment for C.C.C. camps throughout the country was begun almost simultaneously with the Selective Service's February registration.

C.C.C. recruits must be unmarried, jobless, and between the ages of 17 and 23. Before they are sworn in, they will be obliged to sign a pledge that they are willing for the C.C.C. "to send them any place in the United States."

Federal Security Administrator Paul V. McNull pointed out that more and more of the C.C.C. work to be done in the future will "have some connection with" the war. But this assurance did not prevent members of Congress from denouncing the C.C.C. drive as a "subterfuge" designed to cloak a "parasitic enterprise" in the guise of a "military necessity."

For example, Representative Taber of New York, ranking Republican minority member of the House Appropriations Committee and a member of the joint Byrd committee on non-essential Federal expenditures, branded the proposal to keep the C.C.C. program going, in the face of the nation's grave need for farm and war workers, as "simply scandalous."

Said Congressman Taber:

"Why, the farmers of this nation are crying for labor—not only in my district but all over the nation—and here they propose to keep on recruiting young men for a thing which is just a parasite on the public funds.

"Every Congressman I talk to reports the same trouble. Farmers are paying a terrific price for workers and thousands and thousands of them cannot get labor at all. Unless something is done, the farmers of this country are going to be in a terrible plight."

Members of Congress in increasing numbers are said to have indicated their concurrence in the recommendation of the Byrd Committee that the C.C.C. be abolished.

* * *

At the office of the Civilian Conservation Corps it was said that the new enrollees taken for the camps will be only such as the welfare agencies in the various states certify to them.

"We give the boys furloughs if they want to take a job on a farm for some seasonal job — harvesting, or berry picking, or for working in canning factories," the Corps spokesman said.

"The boys go off the C.C.C. payroll when they leave, but the farmer taking them has to pay the going wage in the community and provide the boys with board. Then, when the job is done, they can come back to us and go on the payroll without red tape.

"It's an entirely voluntary proposition. We assume, of course, that the people who make the selections in the local communities will consult the farming groups as to their needs before certifying any of the boys to camp.

"It is entirely up to the local people. They needn't send any boys if they are needed on the farms—but, of course, that must be *bona fide* need too."

The present plan is to reduce the number of C.C.C. camps from 800 to about 600. These 600 camps could accommodate 20,000 men. It is anticipated, however, that the average enrollment in the latest drive will be between 90,000 an 100,000 men!

What, ask the more courageous Congressmen, goes on here?

Rodney Crowther, of the Washington bureau of the *Baltimore Sun*, points out that "a C.C.C. enrollment of 90,000 would make up approximately four times the strength of an army square division, or make up four square divisions, and six triangular divisions at war strength.

"It would be three and one-half times the number of troops the British had in Crete.

"It would be one and a half times the total strength of the British troops in Greece at the time Germany overran that country.

"It would be 8,000 men more than the strength of the entire Northern army's artillery and infantry force at the battle of Gettysburg.

"It would be eight times the force of men which George Washington had with him at Valley Forge, and four and a half times the strength of the Continental army at Yorktown.

"It would be roughly four times the number of regular and reserve officers and flying cadets the United States Army Air Corps had last June 30.

"It would be roughly twice the size of the entire force of British soldiers now fighting in Libya."

A Farmer's Protest

A KANSAS farmer protests to the editor of the *New York Sun* that we have lost the rugged spirit of our ancestors — the spirit which made, and could save, America.

The letter is so typical of the sound sense of the soil tillers that we reproduce it in full.

"To the Editor of the *Sun*: The President has signed a bill providing for continuance of the A.A.A. program for another five years. That program imposes a heavy fine on farmers for planting more acreage than the government designates. That program requires that the immense area of volunteer wheat now growing on the highland plains, with rich promise of yielding at least 60-million bushels, must be plowed under. That program has already worse than wasted many billions of public money. Is it conceivable that such a thing will be endured now that we are faced with the necessity of fighting for our lives?

"The purpose and the spirit that contrived and installed that program are repugnant to the strong and self-reliant spirit that made America. So long as we temporize with the colossal political folly exemplified by this and those other kindred destructive and un-American devices of government, which make pretense of aiming at social and economic reform, we cannot hope successfully to defend our beloved country in this greatest of all wars.

"Men who value their natural rights so lightly that they will submit to a law like the A.A.A. the while they supinely suck its misnamed benefits, have definitely lost something of the sterling spirit of our rugged forbears, which spirit only, in the present crisis, can save America.

"Let all who prize their liberty and love their country forthwith serve notice on our timid, selfish lawmakers that we will no longer tolerate such folly.

"DAN D. CASEMENT.

"Manhattan, Kansas"

Memo for F. D. R.

POSSIBLY Mr. Roosevelt read H. I. Phillips' story in *The Washington Post* entitled "Debunking Needed."

If not, may we reprint it for the edification of the President and all others concerned.

Said Mr. Phillips:

Let's have some priorities on applesauce!

What this country needs as much as anything else in its war effort is a limitation on morale building claptrap from special interests, spotlight lovers, publicists, promoters and fakers.

We favor a Federal Anti-Hooey Administration, and the passage of the following rules at once:

1. There shall be an immediate suspension of the theory that almost any racket is necessary to the upkeep of American morale.

2. All speeches to the effect that the war will be lost if there is any falling off in public interest in bowling, kelly pool, double headers, daily doubles or hoop rolling shall be regarded as anti-American.

3. Use of any microphone to broadcast the nonsense that our Army, Navy and air force will never be able to do its best if the program on a half-mile horse track is cut from eight to seven races shall be forbidden.

4. There shall be an immediate curtailment of the wholesale photographing of spotlight performers in connection with every new campaign, and a little less emphasis on the notion that no drive can be successful unless it is linked up with toe dancers, bathing beauties and strip tease artists.

5. The originator of the idea that Defense Stamp sales could be wonderfully promoted by distributing newspaper pictures of a nearly naked showgirl surrounded by service men picking stamps off her torso shall be deported.

6. The use of most of the cheap, tawdry and distinctly disgusting devices of the burlesque showman, the sideshow ballyhoo man and the honky-tonk press agent in connection with any United States drive designed to command the serious attention of the American people shall be terminated without further notice.

7. All persons aiding the war effort who seem to think the war must be regarded from the same viewpoint as a movie preview, a Hollywood marriage or a five-ring circus shall be regarded as screwy.

8. As a test of sincerity and appreciation of the fact that only the boys in the fighting forces are really important today, all actors, showmen, ice skaters, tightwire walkers, night club comics and clowns shall willingly do what is asked of them in any drive, without pictures.

9. A serious effort shall be made by all leaders in national drives to realize that hokum, baloney, corn and tripe are too cheap to rate any place in the most important undertaking in national history.

10. Before any campaign, movement, drive, effort or what have you is launched in connection with the winning of the biggest war in history, all persons connected with it shall be required to certify that they think the American people sufficiently intelligent to do their bit without being treated as if they were morons, nitwits, degenerates or silly asses who were thrown out of the third grade in public school as problem children.

Comment

Australia's Fate

COMPLEMENTING a previous comment in SOCIAL JUSTICE is a news item from Omaha, Nebraska, which carries remarks made by Dr. Hew Roberts, Australian member of the R.A.F. Reserve and assistant professor at the University of Iowa. Recently this gentleman predicted that Australia will fall in two months and an invasion of the United States may be attempted this summer.

Said he, according to the Associated Press on February 20:

"The great difficulty of the midwest American is to get over the feeling of complacency which results from an inadequate knowledge of economic geography," Dr. Roberts told an American Association of University Women's group.

Pointing to Gen. Douglas MacArthur, he declared the American Government seems to be *making the same mistake of the English in not delegating military authority* to the most vigorous soldiers. He advocated a bigger job for MacArthur than defending a fortress "which must inevitably fall if assistance from the outside cannot reach it."

Confirming the observations of Dr. Roberts is a statement emanating from Mr. William Bullitt who recently gave President Roosevelt a report on the Near East. According to newsmen Pearson and Allen, "Mr. Bullitt goes further than anyone else around the President regarding Allied losses. Not only does he believe that Japan will take India, but he feels that Australia will be lost to the British Empire."

It might be well to inform our readers of an Associated Press dispatch from Canberra, Australia, which has a bearing on this comment. It said:

"The British government is 'sympathetic' to the request of Australian fighter and bomber pilots who want to return home to fight the Japanese, but transport difficulties make it virtually impossible to get back, Prime Minister John Curtin disclosed."

Defense of Singapore

OBSERVERS have noted for several months the growing disaffection of Australia toward London — disaffection caused by British war policies which sapped Australia's defense and increased the possibility of a Japanese invasion of the Australian continent.

SOCIAL JUSTICE has commented several times on the strained relations existing between the mother country and the commonwealth. But it remained for the Washington columnists, Drew Pearson and Robert S. Allen, to report that an open break between the two nations was narrowly averted only a short time ago.

During his conference with American officials in Washington, Winston Churchill clung to the theory that Britain should make no attempt to defend Singapore and the Dutch East Indies because a successful defense would be "impossible," the newsmen said in their "Merry-Go-Round" column recently.

When Richard Casey, Australian minister to the United States, heard of Churchill's decision, he told the British Prime Minister "point-blank that Singapore would have to be defended. He even went to the extreme length of warning that Australian troops would be yanked out of the Near East if the British government did not send reinforcements to Singapore.

"Furthermore," the columnists continued, "the Australian Prime Minister even went to the extent of suggesting that if London was going to desert the Australian people by not defending Singapore, it would be perfectly possible for the Australian government to withdraw from the war and make a separate peace with Germany."

On the basis of this report—and in view of subsequent events—it appears that Britain's defense of Singapore was purely of a token nature, made for the purpose of mollifying Australia.

In short—if Pearson and Allen can be believed—Churchill realized from the very outset of the Malayan campaign that Britain was "through," at least temporarily, in that portion of the Orient.

SOCIAL JUSTICE has said as much—and been assailed as a "defeatist." Now the question may be asked: Is Churchill a "defeatist"?

Lord Beaverbrook Retires

THE LITTLE Canadian who became a big Britisher with the title of Lord Beaverbrook has retired from the Churchill government. He was the holder of four ministries in that administration but recently declined the Prime Minister's invitation to join the new war cabinet.

For fourteen days before his retirement Beaverbrook was Minister of Production. His associates say he found the anomalous position "completely unworkable" because the whole production plan in Great Britain was remarkable for its lack of cohesion and its interminable bungling.

With Beaverbrook's retirement, we begin to see Great Britain's government walk its wobbly way to a social Waterloo. Ernest Bevin and the Laborites are not in sympathy with the Conservative members of government. Sir Stafford Cripps and his Communists are not in harmony with the best thought of the best Englishmen. These are the men coming to the top.

Should Beaverbrook become the Northcliffe of this war to expose government inefficiency as his predecessor did in the last war, it will be a political miracle if Mr. Churchill can carry on.

As there is much labor trouble in the United States despite the fact that we are engaged in a life-and-death struggle, there is found a parallel to our case in England. The great democracies have not succeeded in regimenting labor sufficiently. The only reason that many labor leaders applaud the war efforts of either government is related to the war wages received in both instances.

Churchill's Weak Moment

IN THE SPEECH in which Prime Minister Churchill disclosed the fall of Singapore he made no mention of the battle of Dover which resulted in the destruction of more than 40 English airplanes and the escape of three powerful Nazi naval units to their home harbor at Kiel.

That omission mightily stirred the English public because they regarded the loss of the battle of Dover as a defeat not surpassed by Singapore. It was a defeat which, for the first time in a hundred years, concretely challenged the power of the British Navy.

Pressed to express an opinion on this subject at a later date, Mr. Churchill said the escape of the Scharnhorst, Gneisenau and Prinz Eugen was really a British victory in so far as it took three bothersome naval units from the English Channel. In his customary manner, Mr. Churchill euphoniously transubstantiated a defeat into a victory.

It will be difficult for ordinary Englishmen to see their Prime Minister's point of view because they are still asking what happened to the British Naval Intelligence; they are still wondering why Britain's capital ships did not risk battle.

It is inconceivable how three badly battered Nazi warships could negotiate 300 miles of the English Channel before being detected. But it is very understandable why the British Navy did not risk a battle with them. The plain answer is that Great Britain could not compete in the air with the Nazis.

We are thankful that the British press is incensed over the loss of the battle of Dover. It is within the realm of possibility that good results will be forthcoming from this humiliation.

A Plea for 'More Democracy'

(Continued from Page 9)

In addition to the anti-third term Presidential tradition, which lasted up until the present Administration, the American people have been firmly grounded in a belief that their *Constitution* with its tripartite division of Government with its "checks and balances" is, as the *Times* writer says, a noble document.

They believe, too, that its Colonial framers were exceptional men, characteristic of an age not equalled anywhere. They gravely doubt if the legal minds and political intelligence which framed the American *Constitution* could be found among today's professional politicians. They will be mighty suspicious of any power given to a President to dissolve Congress.

And, yet, an Olympian view of "the peepul," with their supine credulity and prompt parroting of any current propaganda, might cause the present-day historian to wonder whether the voters themselves are as informed and as interested in Government as were those stalwart Colonial farmers who elected the first Continental Congress.

The *Times*' article ignores the power of the people to impeach a President. American Presidents can be—and one was—impeached; but the reluctance of any U. S. Senate to do so, even in peacetime, puts this weapon into complete discard in time of war.

Besides, all the broad outlines of the New Deal's war policies—that is, aid to the British Empire as a defense of America, and international concern ahead of any domestic reform — were all before the voters when Mr. Roosevelt was proposed for an unprecedented third term. The people chose Mr. Roosevelt, and his New Deal Administration accepted this vote as a mandate to carry out the war policy. It even called upon 22-million dissident Republican voters to line up and play ball in the name of "national unity."

Washington political observers, confidentially, do not agree that Mr. Roosevelt and his New Dealers have completely alienated "the peepul"—yet.

So far as a "vote of confidence" in Congress is concerned, the American people have that opportunity before them this year. November is the date—mark it down!

What Others Say

Counter-Revolution

WE ARE living at the end of an era of revolutions. The Communist, Fascist, Nazi and other revolutions are not so much the beginning of a new world order; they are, rather, the dying gasps of an old one.

The French Revolution was a violent protest against privilege and the denial of opportunities to all, but it ended in the Reign of Terror.

The industrial revolution was a protest against the defects which crept into the Guild system, but it ended in the errors of monopolistic capitalism and the violent suppression of the rights of labor.

The Nazi revolution was a violent protest against the alleged injustices of Versailles, but it ended in the barbarism of Hitler.

The Fascist revolution was a violent protest against the alleged errors of congresses, parliaments, and democratic processes, and it ended in the creation of a lackey State for Naziism.

Communism was a violent protest against the alleged errors of capitalism, but it ended, as all economic revolutions do, in the transfer of booty and loot from one man's pocket to the other's.

. . . Only a counter-revolution which does violence to selfishness, and which restores love for humanity, authority to politics, and morality to economics, can produce an order where everyone is victorious and where there are no victims to mourn.

—Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, of the Catholic University of America

* * *

Wanted: Leadership

I DON'T mean to say we have lost this war, but I say we are losing it because we failed to recognize that wars now are fought by industrial brains, not military brains.

Hitler saw it, and he went to work to readjust the entire plan of fighting wars.

Japan followed in step.

Our war effort is being directed entirely by theorists. We are against powerful, big, tough enemies who are giving us everything they've got by making use of their industrial brains.

To win this war we must have a different type of leadership.

—Dr. G. W. Dyer, Professor of Economics, Vanderbilt University

* * *

Christianity

CHRISTIANITY is not a failure, when it is not practiced; nor, when it is not understood. The multiplication table is not a failure, when children do not know how to apply it. The sun is not a failure, because you are sick in your home and not able to receive its rays.

Democracy is not a failure, because the leaders and teachers of its principles have become selfish, greedy and corrupted. Money is not a failure, because people misuse it; or because you have none in your possession. Likewise, Ford is not a failure, because you do not know how to drive a car.

Christianity, its wisdom and virtues, must be practiced and lived to show man *"the Way, the Truth, and the Life."*

But, ignorance is a failure; indifference is a failure; false doctrine is a failure; the heresy of variety is a failure, not the real and genuine Christianity.

—Juan Rivera Rosario, Berkeley, California

* * *

Optimism and War

IT'S A hard job to edit a newspaper in wartime.

There is an ever-present temptation to "play up" American successes with big headlines and hopeful expressions, beyond what is justified.

The truth is that the dangers are very great . . .

Wishing never won a war. Complacency can bring only disaster.

Over and over again, we have seen the tragic results of false hopes in the case of England. We must not fall into the same error.

—The *Pittsburgh Press*

* * *

How to Lose

FOR 15 years, Germany, Italy and Japan have been everything that they believed in. They violated all rules of mankind. Yet, the American people have been half-witted and stupid, unwilling to recognize the situation.

Many think the Japanese did us dirt. We did ourselves dirt. We were the ones who sucked ourselves into Pearl Harbor!

Unless we devote ourselves to an all-out effort to outlaw barbarism, we are not capable of surviving.

We won the chance to make a decent world in the last war and we said to hell with it—we are not interested!

If we lose this chance again, our civilization will be destroyed.

—Herbert Agar, editor of the *Louisville Courier-Journal*

* * *

THE RECENT action of Congress in voting pensions for its own members didn't help civilian morale . . . Perhaps, when Washington has been jarred out of its complacency, the rest of the country will awaken to the danger that we may lose this war unless we cut out all unnecessary activities and concentrate on winning it.

—Cleveland Plain Dealer

* * *

'. . .Fit to Print'

SPEAKING in Cleveland . . . Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau proposed that, because of the war emergency, the Federal Government tax the income from existing state and local securities, even those issued as completely tax-exempt. One amazing result of this statement appears in an editorial in the *New York Times*, which says:

"On Monday, the market for tax-exempt municipals was so badly disorganized by this news that it was thought best not to publish quotations in the following day's editions of this paper."

The *New York Times* is the newspaper which prints the following slogan on page 1 every day: "All the news that's fit to print."

—St. Louis Post Dispatch

Confidence

NOBODY who has the true interest of America at heart would wish to see the President fail. On the contrary, millions of us pray nightly for his success because it means America's success. Yet what is growing more and more incomprehensible every day is the nonchalant way in which the President is conducting this war.

Mr. Roosevelt . . . has virtually the same Cabinet advisers that he had nine years ago. Too often, he resents, if he does not ignore, criticism. When he wants to do something that needs Congressional help, he finds a way to assert leadership. When he doesn't want to get rid of peacetime Government agencies or convert them to war work, he shrugs his shoulders and says it's up to Congress.

Naval officers are afraid of the White House . . . Mr. Roosevelt has not seen fit to inform either the House or Senate committees about the major policies dealing with the war.

As a consequence, confidence in the Administration is weakening on Capitol Hill.

—David Lawrence

* * *

Under Fire

COMPLAINTS over the non-success of the Roosevelt-Churchill strategy since Dec. 8 have been rising for several weeks in both the United States and Great Britain. These complaints reached roar size when Singapore went down, following the German snatch of the *Scharnhorst*, *Gneisenau* and *Prinz Eugen* back to home waters via the English Channel.

Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill are now answering these complaints in a manner which you would expect from strong-minded, strong-willed, self-confident men who have stubbed their toes . . .

There is a growing feeling, too, that the Government is not being as frank with the people as it safely could be about the war's progress . . . There is also a spreading belief that the Administration is playing politics with the war.

—New York Daily News

* * *

Who's Responsible?

EVERY single dollar that President Roosevelt has asked for national defense has been given him. Every grant of power which he requested was voted him.

He tells us that he has known for several years that we were in danger of being attacked. He has had $19-billion for lease-lend purposes and all he wanted for national defense. Ever since March of '33 he and his political friends have been in full, complete charge of the national program and, if, today, we are "unprepared to meet an attack upon our Atlantic or our Pacific coastline," the responsibility for that condition rests squarely upon his shoulders.

On the same day the President uttered the foregoing, the House voted $32-billion —almost as much as the total cost of the first World War—for national defense and lease-lend.

—Representative Clare E. Hoffman, of Michigan

Comment

Litvinov Tosses Out A Veiled Warning

SPEAKING before members of the Overseas Press Club, Ambassador Maxim Litvinov disclosed the naked, unpleasant truth about the United Nations' ineffective efforts to overwhelm Hitler.

In his first formal address the Russian Ambassador reiterated the official strategy previously voiced both by Premier Josef Stalin and Foreign Commissar Molotov which, to their minds, is the only strategy capable of defeating the Nazis. Briefly, it is an offensive strategy by which both the British and Americans would send forces to invade Europe to strike Hitler on the west while the Russians oppose him on the east. Unless this is done—and done soon—Hitler cannot be defeated, the Ambassador intimated.

Mr. Litvinov's words were interpreted in most quarters as a veiled warning, although he said they were "entirely personal."

Said he: "Only by simultaneous offensive operations on two or more fronts separated by long distances could Hitler's armed forces be disposed of and that is just why Hitler would dislike such operations."

Caustically but indirectly, Litvinov criticized the military sit-down strike seemingly approved of by Great Britain in the latter's practiced policy of keeping idle approximately 3-million soldiers in England without making any serious attempt to place them on the continent.

Said Mr. Litvinov:

"We hear a lot about common effort of the United Nations towards achieving victory. But common efforts which do not include common fighting may not be sufficient."

* * *

We are compelled to agree with these ambassadorial remarks: Britain must supplement on the continent her psychological campaign of "V for Victory" with a military campaign of "F for Fighting."

For some time many informed Americans have been aware of the Soviet Union's attitude so succinctly expressed by Mr. Litvinov. For that reason it found echo in the half-hearted appeals made by certain American officials that we abandon a defensive warfare and adopt one of offense. These appeals, however, were rather idealistic when confronted with the alarming facts of our unpreparedness—an unpreparedness problem which will not be solved, perhaps, before 1943.

During the course of his address Mr. Litvinov indirectly challenged the claims of journalists who unceasingly have plagued their readers with a recitation of overwhelming Soviet victories. Said the Ambassador: "Though we have had considerable victories at the front of late, we must not overestimate their significance. The enemy's power has been shaken, but he is far from beaten."

It is understandable why both British and American journalists overestimate outrageously the Soviet winter campaign and its attendant victories. When both British and American forces contributed no news of substantial victories, the Russian efforts were seized upon to strengthen the morale of American and British newspaper readers.

Was it more than a coincidence that Lord Halifax delivered a formal speech on the same day before the American Academy of Political and Social Science? His Lordship lamented the mutual and growing attitude of hyper-criticism evidenced in the United States and Great Britain. Inferentially, he attributed our criticism of Britain to the idleness of the 3-million soldiers comfortably wintering in England. Said His Lordship:

"I hear it said that Britain sits behind three and a half million bayonets in her island fortress and leaves the fighting to her friends.

"Two million of those soldiers are home guards whose full-time work is in war industries. The other million and a half have got to defend something like 3,000 miles of coasts and 90,000 square miles inside them."

This admission on the part of Lord Halifax, while gracious and truthful, will not alter the course of the growing criticism by Americans of Britain. In fact, it is likely to increase it because our citizens will begin speculating on the figures formally presented by His Lordship.

If 2-million soldiers are required to act as home guards in war industries, what interpretation will we put upon the labor situation which requires military supervision? Is the English laboring class so riled and dissatisfied that top sergeants and privates with small arms at their belts are required to maintain order and efficiency?

If 1½-million soldiers are required to defend 3,000 miles of coast and 90,000 square miles of terrain, how many soldiers are required to defend the far-flung areas of the United States and Canada, which countries may soon be subject to invasion?

The Halifax address was a weak answer to the Litvinov formal expression of Soviet expectancy even though the Britisher maintained that his empire's materials were efficacious in the defense of Moscow—an assertion the Soviets might contest. His Lordship's speech did not liquidate the veiled threat contained in Litvinov's words before the Overseas Press Club. It merely emphasized the current of disagreement which is running so turbulently between the various capitals of the United States.

All of this leads us to surmise the possibility of a Soviet defection from the ranks of the United Nations by, approximately, the Fourth of July. As much as Britain and America desire to initiate a compounded and efficient offensive, the truth is they are unprepared to factualize it.

A second truth is that the Soviet Union is engaged in this World War because she was attacked by the Nazis. She is not a part of it because she is interested in defending capitalistic imperialism or democracy. Incidentally, others share our view in this regard. Dorothy Thompson, who seldom agrees with us, expressed the belief last week in her syndicated column that Stalin would withdraw from the war should he succeed in driving Hitler out of Russia while the Allies sit back and offer no substantial military aid.

Mr. Stimson Talking

PREPARING the way for Mr. Roosevelt's February 23rd speech, Secretary of War Stimson made plain that we must be ready to take such blows which, from time to time, the enemy will direct at our coastal possessions and cities.

This aged official made plain that the people must refrain from bringing public pressure to bear to force the War and Navy Departments to fight a defensive war.

"Such pressure, if yielded to, would be the surest way of losing the war that I know," added Mr. Stimson.

He was the same gentleman who persisted that the best way to keep peace was to modify the *Neutrality Act*, to give all aid to Britain, etc., etc.

Meanwhile, America is sadly lacking in anti-aircraft guns, to say nothing of fighter planes upon which we depend. Presumably, we have no adequate supply of anti-submarine vessels else the Germans would not be so successful in their Caribbean forays.

The great error in Mr. Stimson's statements lies in the fact that he lives in the past and is almost totally unaware of the new developments in air power which, we believe, could operate not only from surface air carriers but from submarines.

'Losing the War,' British Are Told

THE New Deal *Chicago Sun* prints a London dispatch (Feb. 22) which reads: "The inescapable conclusion that Britain is in real danger of losing the war was reached by three widely read periodicals . . ."

Quoting from the *Chicago Sun* article:

Most outspoken was the ably written article in the *Economist*, which said:

"At the moment Britain is losing the war. Hitler may be losing it too. Russia may be winning it and America may be preparing to win it—*but Britain is losing it* . . . unless there is a drastic regeneration in the present, there will be no future. As things are going now, there never will be a post-war phase."

For the courageous Britisher who, even after Dunkerque stubbornly refused to admit there was any possibility of defeat, that was a pretty bitter pill to swallow. Yet to the man who once found comfort in the three old saws, "We'll muddle through somehow," "We'll lose every battle but the last one," and "There will always be an England," the evidence now seems to justify the *Economist's* warning.

"The British people have been wonderfully patient under the long string of disasters and disappointments. In the whole history of the war, the British army has not a single success of any importance to its credit—unless it be the very pyrrhic triumph of Dunkerque or the very temporary gains in Libya," the article said.

"True, it has had a great deal of bad luck, but the good general does not have bad luck—soft troops, unenterprising commanders, outwitted strategists, an incompetent administration, an apathetic native population—these are not the signs of a gallant army betrayed by bad luck; they sound uncomfortably like the dissolution of an empire."

The periodical *Tough* also called for action.

"Defeats will not culminate in final victory merely because we flatter ourselves on our capacity to endure them grimly and even cheerfully," it said. "The price of victory is always sacrifice. Never was the British Commonwealth in such jeopardy. The peril is pressing and constant and it will remain so for some time to come," it said.

The *Tribune*, the Liberal weekly of which Sir Stafford Cripps, lord privy seal and leader of the House of Commons, is a former editorial director, declared bluntly:

"In the present year it is possible for the Allies to be defeated. There is no despondency in the nation, but there is justifiable alarm."

Comment

President's Speech

(Continued from Page 4)

most devastating argument against the employment of his own strategy.

* * *

Consider that our enemy has either captured or nullified every first-class naval base in the East. By cunning and daring use of his air power, our enemy also has rendered it almost impossible from a tactical point of view for the United Nations to maintain an air base between the Hawaiian Islands and Australia. The truth of this statement, be it re-emphasized, is recognized when we remember how the Japanese have gained control over oil and gasoline stocks in the Orient. Both India and Australia are non-oil-producing countries.

In attempting to justify the employment of his strategy the President hallowed it with the argument of age: It was 40 years old. That is precisely the trouble. It is 40 years old.

It is the strategy inferentially condemned by General Mitchell 25 years ago — the same General who understood its weakness because it was predicated upon mastery of the seas only and not mastery of the air.

Thus we find Mr. Roosevelt pursuing the blueprints of a strategy doomed to failure from the outset at Dunkirk, Crete, the China Sea, Pearl Harbor, Singapore and the Straits of Dover. In each instance the bomber, the fighting plane and an abundance of fuel and lubrication insisted upon the adoption of a new strategy. Japan has gained an immense reservoir of raw materials—including that vital essential of oil and gasoline. Japan, as Mr. Churchill says, holds the upper hand.

If we hold fast to a sea-born strategy, we are destined to fight a losing battle which will cost us the major portion of the men and materials we send abroad to implement it. The President himself admits this tacitly when he says: "Even if the attack (Pearl Harbor) had not been made, your map will show that it would have been a hopeless operation for us to send the fleet to the Philippines through thousands of miles of ocean, while all those island bases were under the sole control of the Japanese." He might have added that they were under the control of the Japanese because our enemy controlled the air. The same enemy now will control the oil.

We are practical enough to ask ourselves the leading question: "Why attempt the hopeless?" The question is more pertinent when we remember that a Japanese submarine was bombing the coast of California; that Nazi submarines were devastating cargo bottoms in the Caribbean at the moment the President was arguing in defense of his case, strategy number two.

* * *

Now we come to that portion of the President's speech in which he dealt with Pearl Harbor and its consequences. Although the Chief Executive revealed some facts and figures relative to this disaster, he was more concerned with the rumors which began to circulate following December 7th.

He should not be surprised that rumors multiplied, because Government officials were prone to underestimate the damage done to our fleet and air force. Following those understatements came the Roberts' Report which indicted Admiral Kimmel and General Short. Then came silence. But many Americans knew that the Admiral and the General merely shared responsibility for the disaster with their superiors at Washington.

On February 14th many Americans were surprised to hear that eight of our nine capital ships stationed at Pearl Harbor were seriously damaged; that 473 of our bombers—light and heavy—were put out of commission. This information was publicized by Representative Jesse P. Wolcott in a speech which he delivered at Lapeer, Michigan.

Moreover, many Americans read carefully Winston Churchill's address delivered before the British House of Commons January 27, 1942. Therein Mr. Churchill said that Mr. Roosevelt, on the high seas, gave Churchill hope that America would get into the war whether or not Japan attacked America. That was a fearful revelation which gave birth to many more rumors.

Upon this point Mr. Roosevelt did not touch in his February 23rd address. It would have been profitable for him to have done so because the Churchill statement bred much suspicion in the minds of Americans. In fact, Mr. Churchill in the speech referred to and in other pronouncements has stunned rather than inspired Americans. It was he who said that he worked to get us into war—"That is what I have dreamed of, aimed at and worked for and now it has come to pass."

Speaking of Pearl Harbor, Mr. Churchill said that the dominant American battle fleet in the Pacific, plus the "naval force we could spare" confronted Japanese aggression with a shield of superior sea power; but this, "for the time being" had been "dashed to the ground."—(*N. Y. Sun*).

That is a more substantial "rumor" concerning the December 7th tragedy than has been uttered by any American.

* * *

To keep the record straight on further "rumors" we quote verbatim the words uttered by Prime Minister Churchill in his address to the House of Commons last January 27th. Said he:

> On the other hand, the probability since the Atlantic Conference, at which I discussed these matters with President Roosevelt, *that the United States even if not herself attacked would come into the war in the Far East* and thus make the final victory assured, seemed to allay some of these anxieties: and that expectation has not been falsified by the events.

The substance of the above words is known to all Americans. These words, in part, cancel out the dastardly attack of the Japanese. They indicate that while Mr. Roosevelt was proclaiming his policy of peace he permitted the British Prime Minister to hope we would get into the war in the East even though we were not attacked.

Mr. Roosevelt cannot assuage the minds of Americans on the subject of rumor when our citizens are disturbed with the above facts. He should have denied Churchill's inferred charge or else should have made some attempt to rationalize it.

As matters stand Mr. Roosevelt may find himself as much before the bar of American public opinion as does Leon Blum in France. As it is he stands virtually indicted by Prime Minister Winston Churchill for permitting the latter to hope our nation would get into a shooting war whether or not the United States was attacked.

There is no rumor being circulated in the United States comparable either in inference or charge to that passed along by Churchill. The Prime Minister's statement has "pearl-harbored" the confidence of the citizens—a confidence that cannot be restored until Mr. Churchill modifies his statement, confessing that it expressed a thought which was open to misinterpretation; or until Mr. Roosevelt courageously publishes what actually took place between himself and the British Prime Minister.

As long as that famous, or infamous, Churchillian statement remains intact upon the record of history it will becloud every pronouncement made from 1937 to 1942 by the President of our country, who time and again proclaimed that he would not lead this nation into war—unless attacked.

* * *

It is trivial to recall that portion of the President's speech in which he says he will not advertise the number of planes we lost lest our enemy gain important information. Mr. Roosevelt, however, knows that the Japanese lost more planes than did the Americans. Evidently, his intelligence service is functioning better now than it did for eight years preceding Pearl Harbor.

It is not trivial, however, to recall these words of the President: "I know that I speak for the mass of the people when I say that we reject the turtle policy and will continue increasingly the policy of carrying the war to the enemy in distant lands and distant waters—as far as possible from our own home ground." (Strategy number two.)

Nature did not endow our Chief Executive with a square jaw for no purpose. He is determined to carry through even though victory follows victory for the foe; even though the military, naval and air wealth of America is being dissipated in defeat following defeat; even though we are inviting invasion by a powerful aggregation of foes; even though our homeland is unprepared to face such a catastrophic event.

The President does speak for the mass of the people; but that is not important. What is important is this question: "Does he speak in the interest of security and well-conceived planning?"

All in all, Mr. Roosevelt's February 23rd speech does not deserve the flattery poured upon it by Lord Beaverbrook. His Lordship did our President an injustice when he said that it was one of the outstanding orations of our times. We who know the President evaluate his speech as one of his weakest oratorical efforts—made in defense of a doomed strategy. It was a speech notable for its inherent contradictions, its mountainous omissions and its abortive attempt to allay so-called complacency.

Although the Chief Executive is definitely correct in not detailing information of value to the enemy, we remind Americans that, to date, the President has not publicized the documents which passed between the Japanese and American Governments prior to Pearl Harbor and the declaration of war.

If Mr. Roosevelt is thoroughly convinced of the soundness of the Americans' demands upon the Japanese, we suggest that he publish for our people the documents in which these demands are contained in order to factualize the unity which is so necessary in the conduct of an all-out war.

As long as these documents are withheld from the people there will always be doubts.

Totalitarianism Forges Ahead in Great Britain

MANY Englishmen fear the peace as much as they do the war.

Some of them go so far as to prevision the Labor Party setting up a totalitarian form of government patterned exactly on the Nazi model.

In a recent issue of the London *Weekly Review*, England's post-war labor problem is treated very objectively by H. D. C. Pepler.

Following are some of his remarks:

"The Labour Party are apparently set for Totalitarianism exactly to the Nazi model, but with their party leaders in the place of Hitler, Goering and Ribbentrop —only it is to be called 'dynamic democracy.'

"From time to time there is a kind of bark from the back benches which has a snarl in it, a class-war veteran smells blood —not his own but somebody else's—and is away with as much fury as a pack of Huns after a Jew . . .

"To them a man of property is a kind of financial reservoir in which money, that should be flowing gently from pocket to pocket among the rest of the community, is stored for purposes of oppression. They confuse capital with income. They think only in terms of pounds, shillings and pence; to them there is no distinction between property in land, property in consols, property in an insurance company and property in a factory.

"They also have the strange idea that the State can run things better than the individual and are, to a man, totalitarian.

"The problem of capital may be stated quite simply. W. owns 20 hens, he owns them absolutely, he can kill and eat them, he may use their feathers for pipe cleaning, nose-tickling in faints, mattress stuffing or as an ornament in his hat. Likewise, he may consume their eggs or give them away. Briefly, he is free to do what he likes with them.

"Those hens are capital, property.

"Those eggs are income, interest.

"The hens' best service is in the production of eggs. They might have their necks wrung and make W. independent of the meat ration for a week or two—but thereafter his family larder would be definitely impoverished. Cakes, custard, bacon, spinach, toast would be shorn of their glory, not to mention vitamins, and the baby's main dish disappear from its menu.

"It does not require a degree in the London School of Economics in order to see that the destruction of such capital is suicidal. Nor does it involve a course of mathematics to decide that the more people in possession of such capital the better for everybody (i.e., the State). If by a levy on capital we meant taking away from those with too many hens in order to give to those with too few, the levyers might engage our sympathy, especially if we were among the henless. But is that Mr. Horabin's meaning? When Mr. Horabin, having the Speaker's eye, says 'Conscription of property is as equally essential as the conscription of manpower,' has he visions of halving W's hens that Y may go into the poultry business or does he envisage marshalling yards for Rhode Island Reds and Buff Orpingtons from all over the country, massed together for egg laying? . . .

* * *

"Now a Mr. B. owns £100 worth of War Loan. This sum having been lent to the Government may count as conscript—I don't know. The Chancellor of the Exchequer can take that hundred and write down fifty, there will be that much less interest to pay and that much less income and security for B. But what does that matter? Mr. Horabin may prefer the more usual method in which the hundred remains a hundred in name, but is worth but half when it is spent.

"The amusing part is that while B's hundred pounds loses in purchasing power, W's hens become more valuable in terms of cash, though their egg production changes not at all.

"The conscription of wealth is nothing new. Death duties (inheritance taxes), for example. Here capital is conscripted with both hands. This unhappy experiment in State Robbery means that W's widow will have to follow up the funeral with a sale. A certain number of the hens will have to leave the roost. The poor woman will have to work as hard as before, the reduction in the fowl yard will not save her labour in feeding and cleaning . . . And she may have to sell her house and find a cheaper one because a home is an entity not built for division.

"I know that the duties are graded so that the smaller the estate the less the charge, but that does not affect the principle of destruction inherent in the capital levy, consuming that which is more valuable when unconsumed and 'in production.' It is a vicious principle because it entirely fails to recognize the unities into which property naturally falls—the unities of use . . .

"A nation which lives upon its capital is a foolish nation.

"The conscription of man-power is the taking over, temporarily, of the use of so much man energy for a given end. The nation naturally wants to control the maximum of that power for the purpose of defeating its enemies. The nation may be compelled to take all W's eggs after allowing him enough to keep alive. But to take the hens and the land they occupy, is to destroy not only W's property but a source of our national wealth. The conscription of property takes over and ultimately destroys the source from which man's energy is derived.

"Such conscription cannot, however, always be avoided, like necessity it knows no law . . .

"Conscription of Capital is a more delicate operation than the conscription of man, not because W. is less valuable than his hens but because man cannot exist without it. Adam did not emerge into a nothing, he was set up in life with a rich dowry. If we monkey with that dowry we die. According to Milton, the Theologians and the Book of Genesis, Adam's first disobedience was a pretty costly affair. That is why property should be handled tenderly.

* * *

"It is both misleading and dangerous to compare persons with property, it is also absurd. Property is a condition of our existence, there is not a moment in the life of Mr. Griffiths (member of House of Commons) when he is any more independent of property than he is of air. The whole matter is whether or not it is abused, whether it is administered efficiently to the needs of the community.

"The most vital property is the land; the community can say whether or not the farmer's corn makes good bread, how much cream there is in the milk he supplies, whether his hedges are cut and his fields are free from thistle. But the community has no knowledge of how to grow corn, keep cows or avoid weeds. Only farmers know these things and they will not be responsive to a Commissar spy system organized by the Ministry of Agriculture.

"The same is true of every craft and trade . . . these are always of more value to the community when privately owned . . .

"The Labour Party reminds me of the two blind lunatics unsuccessfully attempting to knock a nail into a wall. One complained: 'They have put the head on the wrong end of the nail.'

" 'No' said the other. 'They evidently made the nail for the other side of this wall'."

Sees English People Victims of Misrule

"THE PEOPLE to be most pitied in this war are the 98 per cent of the common people of England who today are paying the price for having been led by an aristocracy unfit to rule in this twentieth century," William J. Baxter of the International Economic Research Bureau, wrote shortly before American entrance into the war.

If American boys are to be sacrificed for the failure of that aristocracy, it would be the most criminal program ever proposed to America, the economist declared.

Mr. Baxter contended that England has been hopelessly backward since 1890, in government, in policies and in education, because the 2 per cent of the population who control government and wealth have refused to meet changing conditions.

"Insofar as 98 per cent of the common people of England are concerned, the tragic blunder of the 2 per cent was the fact that the government of England refused to accept the fact that there were startling new discoveries, not only in the economic world, but in the armament world as well.

"This 2 per cent persisted in the delusion, first, that large accumulated wealth would enable England to defeat her opponents; and second, sea power was still dominant and could control the seas despite the amazing progress of the science of aviation."

In Mr. Baxter's judgment this was a fatal error. He asserts without reservation that "no power on earth can save England, for the English have not been backward for only a few years, but rather, during our entire generation."

Letters

SOCIAL JUSTICE aims to make this page a free forum and readers' opinions are invited. Naturally the views expressed are not always those of this magazine. We cannot guarantee that contributions sent to SOCIAL JUSTICE can be returned to the writers. Letters not signed with the writer's name and address cannot be considered, although the name will not necessarily be used. We reserve the right to publish all letters received unless contrary instruction is specifically given.

Why Such Confidence?

TO THE EDITOR:

The reason given by the British for practically putting Cecil Brown of C.B.S. out of Singapore was rather flimsy, for he was decidedly pro-British.

His broadcast from Sydney, Australia, was astounding. He said the reason for the debacle in Singapore was that the British were certain that the Japanese would not attack them. When the Japanese did attack, the British were stunned and utterly unprepared.

For months the British press had shouted and their leaders had said brazenly that the United States must, and would, go to war against Japan. Mr. Churchill also said that in case of an attack upon the United States, Britain would declare war on the attacker within 24 hours.

Why, then, were the British at Singapore stunned when Japan also declared war on them? Can it be that they had some secret assurance that the Japanese would attack the United States but not Britain?

We have been so lend-lease looney that "Winnie" may have thought that if our leaders were willing to bankrupt the United States and sacrifice millions of our soldiers to spite a man with a Chaplin mustache, maybe they would also be supine enough to take even that betrayal.

Has Churchill "something on" our leaders?

Will history record that because Japan beat Britain at her own game, when she attacked Singapore rather than our West Coast, our people in California, Oregon and Washington were spared that terrible calamity!

False friends are more dangerous than an enemy.

Ferndale, Michigan — E.C.B.

They Got Us In!

TO THE EDITOR:

At last it is officially admitted—what many of us had claimed for several years—that British politicians, international bankers and propagandists did all they could to get us into the war they were planning.

Winston Churchill himself said in his Feb. 15th speech, ". . . the United States is now unitedly and wholeheartedly in the war with us . . . That is what I have dreamed of, aimed at and worked for, and now it has come to pass!"

That Churchill speech will be a good thing to keep, and quote, by those who will write books after the war exposing those at home and abroad really responsible for having American boys killed off again by the thousands on foreign soil.

And don't think there won't be another set of startling exposes—startling, that is, to the naively trusting and unwary—providing we have freedom of the press after the war.

Littlstown, Pa. — P.E.W.

'Fire Sale' Special

TO THE EDITOR:

I see where Walter Winchell backs producer John Golden's idea that the amusement tax on theater tickets be taken off for soldiers in uniform.

This, at most, amounts to a few cents; like those 2.98 "fire sale" bargains.

Why not take off the admission price?

Heaven knows the boys won't see many shows. Since they are giving their lives to defend America, it seems to me the millionaire amusement business could spare more than a couple of cents—especially since the movie employes have been exempted from military service!

Winchester, Virginia —P.K.

War Is Not Politics

TO THE EDITOR:

There are two simple lessons the anti-Axis leaders must learn soon; and the sooner the better.

First, there really is a difference between a political campaign and a war. Elections may be won on promises and by deceiving your own people, but wars must be won by action, and deceiving the enemy.

Second, things must be done efficiently, wholeheartedly, or not at all.

Even the most stupid person realizes that if we expect to win this war we must "sell all we possess" and give to the war fund; and ourselves and our families into slavery.

Does "V" for victory mean that much to the average American?

We are not "defeatists," we realize that the only alternative to victory now is defeat; but, also, we are not completely "dumb."

St. Louis, Missouri. — A.M.

Many Cities Already Do

TO THE EDITOR:

I think that trains, buses and street-cars should let soldiers and sailors ride free. In time of war many of these fellows in the service of their country are a long way from home. When they do get a brief furlough they often do not have enough money to take them home to see their folks and back again, and have to depend on the kindness of motorists along the route.

I also think the movie theaters should admit the boys free. We see these fellows in uniform pasted on billboards, asking the public to back them with their bonds and stamps; "you give a little, they are giving all."

Then let some of these big rich corporations show their appreciation and patriotism by giving these young heroes free transportation.

—J.K.

Philadelphia, Pa.

Let Us Have Confidence!

TO THE EDITOR:

A shipyard worker at Hog Island during World War I, and again a defense worker in this war, I wish to give you some frank observations on the morale of my average fellow worker.

I find that his morale is not based on hate for enemies or love for so-called allies, but on his confidence or lack of confidence in the men at Washington. And that confidence, contrasted with 1917, is practically *nil*.

From Washington down, everything is confusion: nobody has the simple authority to make a clear-cut decision about anything; and, conversely, nobody has the courage or the authority to challenge anything that schemers make bold to put over.

The old "zip" of the Spanish-American war, and World War I is missing all along the line. And the one reason is—lack of faith in the competence and efficiency of the men at the head of our wartime government.

—F.R.

Los Angeles, Calif.

Sound Money

TO THE EDITOR:

Several years ago, one of your correspondents suggested that we, the people, could do something definite about the unconstitutional money system, by refusing to carry checking accounts and refusing to handle Federal Reserve notes.

The writer took this suggestion seriously and has since refused to handle anything but "lawful money of the United States"—that is, U. S. notes, silver certificates, silver and copper token money.

For the benefit of those interested, I might say that all of the one dollar bills are "good" (silver certificates), and so are almost all of the five dollar bills (silver certificates and U. S. notes).

In a few isolated cases, where I was compelled to accept a Federal Reserve note in change, I promptly turned it in at the first bank I passed, and demanded "lawful money" for it.

There is so little "lawful money" in the country, however, that if everyone reading SOCIAL JUSTICE were to refuse to have anything to do with the phony money racket, the unconstitutional private issue of money would break up in three months!

— Constitutional Money Advocate.

Detroit, Michigan

The 85 Per Cent Are Loyal But They're Not Hoodwinked

TO THE EDITOR:

What would we do during these trying days, without the stout hearts and level heads trained by the teachings and the example of Father Coughlin?

Because a certain all-powerful international financial *clique* wanted this war, and finally got it (though not the way they "planned"), the American people, it seems, must jump to the crack of the whip, whether it be snapped by a silver-toned orator, a movie actor, or a bunch of theoretical Reds.

We are good Americans. We will co-operate with our Commander-in-Chief, though inwardly seething with disgust at official bungling and inefficiency.

We are treated with news reports amazing in their sham—ships, tankers PROBABLY sunk; troops, attempted landings PROBABLY repulsed!

But will any attempt be made to help Gen. MacArthur? If we understand the President, none will be. The general has just surprised us by overstaying the time estimated for his defense to hold out!

In one of his recent broadcasts, Eric Sevareid takes the American people to task severely in that they are not sufficiently aroused to this war *tempo*. He says that while it is unlikely that bombs will fall on us—more's the pity—bombs would wake us up to a realization that we are in the war, etc.

Indeed, Mr. Sevareid!

Who wanted this war?

Little does Eric take into account the resentment of 85 per cent of the American people who did everything possible to prevent the useless slaughter brought on by the aggressive provocations of the 15 per cent!

The 85 per cent whose will was completely defied, when they protested every step toward war, are now expected to turn mental somersaults, and whoop it up for a war they did not want, to suit the tune of the war-mongering 15 per cent.

The 85 per cent—make no mistake about it — are LOYAL AMERICANS; they are doing more than their share in tears, toil, sweat and taxes. But they do not—and will not—forget that in making their sacrifice they are paying for the folly of the stupid war-willing 15 per cent.

Do not, therefore, expect the country to give blind support to bald inefficiency under any cloak of military secrecy; or any blank-check surrender of our Constitutional guarantees to a crowd of politicians who have demonstrated their ineptitude over many years.

We, the 85 per cent, are not disloyal. We do not, however, intend to get hysterical in our war-mindedness.

Again, make no mistake about it—WE DO INTEND TO RESCUE AND SAVE AMERICA!

—A.J.M.

Washington, D. C.

Letters

English Insurance

TO THE EDITOR:

In a recent issue of SOCIAL JUSTICE you devote a whole page to English fire insurance companies. The writer failed to mention several points.

For example: Regardless of the amount of the premiums taken in by a fire insurance company, whether American or English. 50 to 55 per cent is paid back in the expense of operation; 40 to 50 per cent is paid back in losses. As soon as $1 in premium is received 50 cents of it must be put in reserve. Under the law this reserve must be invested subject to the approval of the state insurance commissioner.

Furthermore, an English company can only advertise or operate on the basis of its U.S. assets. An English company can only remit profits or dividends to the home office after approval by the state commissioner having jurisdiction. A profit of 6 per cent, on underwriting experience, is remarkable for either an American company or an English company. Dividends are usually paid out of the banking or investment end of the business.

All stock fire insurance companies, whether American or English, operate under the same laws promulgated by the 48 states. To operate in any state all companies have to put up a deposit that may run into $100,000 or more. Fire insurance companies pay heavy taxes, and increasing taxes, to the states, while insurance is almost the only commodity whose cost has steadily gone down.

It is easier to liquidate an American company than an English one. The record of English companies after and during the San Francisco fire was above reproach. The home offices sent millions to meet their obligations 100 per cent!

Within the last decade, due to bad underwriting loss experience, one English company sent to its U.S. offices $3-million. Employes and officers of English-owned companies are about 99 per cent American citizens with no restrictions as to race, color or religion.

I could go on down the list but this is sufficient.

I think you want to be fair; at least I gather that from years of reading the magazine. If I did not think so I would not send the enclosed check asking you to extend my subscription another year.

Cleveland, Ohio. — E.O.T.

Same Politicians

TO THE EDITOR:

A few weeks ago one of the correspondents in SOCIAL JUSTICE said the people made a mistake in 1936 when they did not elect Landon. But, had the Republicans won in 1936, would not the people have got Stimson and Knox, the war men of Roosevelt's 1940 New Deal party, just the same? The professional politician believes in getting there, one way or another.

Philadelphia, Pa. — J. O'K.

Waiting Clear Orders

TO THE EDITOR:

In the article captioned "Why Are You Fearful?" (SOCIAL JUSTICE, Feb. 2) you ask very properly, Where are the "outspoken apostles of social justice" who are presently "burying their heads in the sands of silence?"

Where and why, indeed?

Then you recall to the people—by whom you doubtless mean the rank and file—the obligation imposed upon those who, in Confirmation, became willing soldiers of Jesus Christ.

That is very pertinent, too. But it seems to me that courage is not necessarily rashness. Even a hero might wish to know under whose banner, and in which direction, he is to march. When the commands of superior officers (if they can be heard) are conflicting, and confusing, I am sure one is being no less a good soldier when he waits until he knows where he is going and whether the mask his captain wears is meant to be a protection or a deception.

The Tennyson who could write (and mean it):

"Theirs not to make reply,
Theirs not to reason why,
Theirs but to do and die."

was a better poet than a logician.

If we are not to reason, why, then, were we given the faculties of reasoning, the distinguishing mark between man and beast?

In closing, may I do what I have been wishing to do for a long time; compliment SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine on its consistent and constructive journalistic contributions. We were poor indeed without them.

— I.A.T.

Philadelphia, Pa.

Miss Thompson Needn't Worry; Mr. and Mrs. America Are Mad

TO THE EDITOR:

Dorothy Thompson wants Americans to "get mad" in order to win the war.

If she had any opportunity to speak to the small fry, "Plain Mr. and Mrs. America," she would learn that they are darn mad right now! Every day their righteous anger mounts.

Why doesn't Dorothy Thompson tell her good friends in the New Deal party to "get mad," too?

The Plain American Citizen was told that U.S.A. would be safe if only we kept our friends in Europe supplied with war material. Every day, we hear our European friends are retreating in Asia and, as they do so, more and more of our own means of protection falls into enemy hands.

The Plain American Citizen has seen his sons, father and brother march away to join the fight that was too much for our friends in Europe. We have been told that we must be taxed to the limit of human endurance — that our American "standard of living" may not exist any more and that vast spending will reduce our country to the verge of bankruptcy—all in order to destroy Hitlerism.

At the same time—and all that time—we were sending scrap iron and oil to Japan! And now we are to be asked to ration scrap iron and oil.

It would be a splendid idea if Dorothy Thompson could make somebody in the New Deal mad enough to realize that America belongs to Americans whatever happens in the rest of the world.

But they seem more interested in voting themselves pensions, creating all sorts of soft well-paid jobs for their own families and friends, and in sending more supplies and more boys to Europe—than to realize that some morning they may awake to hear that both Alaska and the Panama canal have been attacked and taken over night.

America, Miss Thompson, is darn mad! We only wish that some of our leaders in Washington, D. C., felt as violently about all this as we do.

Detroit, Michigan. — M.A.G.

Birthday Greeting

TO THE EDITOR:

On a Sunday afternoon about 12 years ago, I turned on my radio to tune in the Philharmonic orchestra in New York. One turn of the knob was not enough to get the station. Instead, quite to my amazement I heard substantially the following words coming from the radio:

"I am convinced from evidence I have in hand that the international banking fraternity sent a man from England to this country in 1873 with $500,000 to 'buy our Congress,' to demonetize silver and do away with bi-metalism."

I was stunned, but pleasantly so, because this subject has been my "pet peeve" for the last 38 years. I was curious to learn the identity of the speaker and continued listening until an announcer said: "You have been listening to Father Charles E. Coughlin, pastor of the Shrine of the Little Flower."

I sat staring at the radio for several minutes. Then I, by repute a hard-headed and cold-blooded business man, and a Protestant, said "Father, forgive me for any prejudice I may have had in the past."

Since that day I listened to practically all of Father Coughlin's broadcasts and have read every issue of SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine from cover to cover.

I have been amazed at the tremendous fund of accurate information that has been given us in both the broadcasts and the magazine.

One of the great crimes of the ages is that our radio and press have not been giving these same vital facts to the people all the time.

If I were to be granted one last wish, it would be that every voter in America would have the experience of reading with an open mind any two or three issues of SOCIAL JUSTICE.

I am convinced that this would save our America!

Congratulations and a happy birthday to SOCIAL JUSTICE!

— W.M.G.

Chicago, Illinois

MORE PLANES TODAY, OR NO BLUEBIRDS TOMORROW!

—From the Pittsburgh Press

Comment

One Out of Every Three Men May Fight

(Continued from Page 5)

armed services during 1942. The army will grow from 1,700,000 to 3,600,000; this latter total includes the 1-million-man air force recently announced. In addition to the 1,900,000 new soldiers during 1942, there will be more than 350,000 new sailors and marines. Perhaps all but 250,000 or 300,000 of these fighting men will come from the present 1-A draft group and from the 20-year-olds.

Government economists guess that between the end of 1941 and the end of 1942 the nation's manpower and womanpower will have been shifted as follows (in millions):

	1941	1942
Men in the armed forces	2.0	4.2
Men and women in war industries	5.0	15.0
Men and women in civilian industries	29.8	21.8
Farm workers	8.9	8.5
Self employed	6.0	5.5
Unemployed	3.7	2.4
Total labor and fighting force	55.4	57.4

This table shows that the biggest shift in the lives of men and women in 1942 will be from civilian work to war work, not from working to fighting. It also shows that another 2-million persons, most of them women, must be drawn into the nation's fighting-working forces during 1942.

* * *

The year 1943 may unfold a very different story. In that year the biggest shift probably will be from working to fighting.

No table as detailed as the one above has been compiled for the end of 1943, but piecing together unrelated official estimates, indicates something like this (in millions):

	1942	1943
Men in the armed forces	4.2	10.0
Men and women in war industries	15.0	19.0

The relatively small rise in munitions workers reflects the expectation that, as munitions plants hit full stride, their productivity per worker will increase. The relatively large increase in men in the armed forces reflects the expectation that by 1943 a big American Army and Navy will be needed for the last, desperate phase of the war.

In appropriation bills, in speeches by ambassadors, and in official reports the hint already has been dropped that the eventual goal of the army is 7-million men. The Air Corps goal of 2-million men already has been announced, and the probability is that this 2-million is not included in the 7-million total. Moreover, during 1943 and 1944 the Navy's huge building program should have upped the need for sailors and marines to well over a million men.

No such army and navy can be raised without seriously disturbing present family and occupational relationships. If the armed forces are to reach a total of over 10-million sometime during 1943-44, the men will have to be drawn from the 26-million now registered or about to be registered, from the 1-million or slightly more who become 20 years old each year, and, if the draft law is amended, from the 2-million who are 18 and 19 years old.

In short, the over-all chances are that one out of three American men between the ages of 18 and 45 will serve in the armed forces.

Little Lesson in Interest

LUCAS COUNTY, Ohio, now owns its courthouse.

In the presence of county officials, a ceremony was made of burning the $500,000 building bonds in the powerhouse furnace.

An item in the *Toledo Blade* comments:

"The bonds were issued in 1894, and were called in 1938. It took three years to collect all of them, so they could be destroyed. *The county paid $800,000 in interest before the bonds were called.*"

That's all; just a little item. The payment of $800,000 interest, in addition to the principal of $500,000, by the taxpayers is such a commonplace of banking practice that it is hardly "news."

Since 1894, when the Ohio county bonded the taxpayers to build a courthouse, the United States has fought three wars, the country has gone through as many depressions; banks have failed; people have lost their homes and merchants their businesses; alternating deflation and inflation have affected the value of our currency—but the courthouse debt has continued sacrosanct!

The United States may win the war, or lose it; we may pay our vast national debt or "repudiate" payment, but mortgage debts and their load of usurious interest will endure after everything else is lost. It may take another declaration of independence and another American revolution to change it.

U. S. Lacks Ships For Offensive War

(Continued from Page 7)

a successful offensive. Without ships, a great percentage of the guns, tanks, munitions and airplanes we manufacture will find their way to the docks of Boston, New York, Jersey City, Hoboken, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Norfolk, New Orleans, Galveston, San Pedro, San Francisco and Seattle only to be piled there to deteriorate.

Ships and more ships, therefore, are the order of the day.

* * *

For this year 8-million tons of ships are expected to be built.

For 1943, 10-million tons are planned.

In other words, this program calls for 800 ships this year and 1,000 ships next year.

The ship-building plan appears to be going along according to schedule. Even in inland cities, such as Denver, parts of ships are being manufactured.

Admiral Land has been appointed by the President to exercise complete control over the ship-building project—a project that must turn out more than two ships a day else there can be no hope of defeating the Japanese or the Nazis even though we produce 185,000 or 500,000 airplanes in our factories.

The President said—and we all know it to be true—that fighter airplanes cannot fly to the Orient. Bomber planes can win no battles alone. While the latter can destroy property, they themselves are easy targets for speedy fighters.

We need ships to carry the fighter planes to the Orient. We need 100 tons of shipping to back up each man we send to the Orient.

Realize that a ship can make only three trips a year to Australia.

Realize that it requires approximately 46 days for a ship to cargo freight to Egypt or India.

Realize that Americans need five times as many ships as do the Japanese for cargoing munitions and men because the Japanese are five times as close to the seat of conflict.

Realize that the Japanese need no ships to carry their fighter planes to the seat of conflict because their fighter planes can fly there.

If the experts in Government are correct when they tell us that one soldier requires 100 tons of shipping to sustain him, then 20-million tons of shipping, or 2,000 ships, can service no more than 200,000 soldiers.

* * *

These figures give a rough idea of the difficulties confronting us when we elected to pursue a policy of fighting 2-million well-equipped Japanese in their own theater of war—a war theater dominated by enemy bombers and fighting planes.

Mr. Alexander, the First Lord of the British Admiralty, recently disclosed in an official report the achievements of the British navy. In his report he incorporated the statement that Britain has not been able to sink German submarines as fast as they can be produced.

That is not a very heartening statement when we consider that submarines, independent of bombers, have been destroying United Nations' ships at the rate of 400,000 tons per month in the Atlantic and Mediterranean waters.

In our own country it has been disclosed that, over a given period of weeks, Japan lost 300,000 tons of shipping against an American loss of 150,000 tons.

If the ratio between the United States and Japan for useable ships is 5 to 1, our loss represents a comparative loss of 750-000 tons as against the 300,000-ton loss suffered by the Japanese.

But in the matter of replacement, it is estimated that we will produce 8-million tons of shipping this year against a possible 1-million tons by the Japanese.

All these figures, which are correct, as far as we know, are set down to impress upon Americans the mammoth task confronting them if they continue pursuing the policy of fighting the Japanese in the enemy's territories.

FOR THE SAFETY OF OUR BOYS

IF YOU HAVE a brother or a son in the service, or some friend in whom you have a special interest, it is your privilege to have his name enrolled under the special patronage of St. Sebastian.

St. Sebastian is the service men's friend.

Soldier, athlete and Christian disciple, the young saint is a fine example for our boys.

A beautiful sterling silver St. Sebastian medallion and chain, which those under the saint's protection may wear, has been prepared and will be mailed to those who write to us for it. Your boy in the service will prize its possession.

You may compensate us for the outlay of money for these medals and the cost of mailing them, by securing a new subscription to SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine.

ST. SEBASTIAN BRIGADE

Name..... (State Rank)

Army ☐
Navy ☐
Marine Corps ☐

Service Address..... P. O.....

City..... State.....

Formerly of: City..... State.....

Submitted by: Name..... Relationship.....

City..... State.....

Please send St. Sebastian Medal:

Direct to Service Address ☐
To Writer ☐

NATIONAL WEEKLY
Social Justice
Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

A New Day Dawning

WAR is a negation of peace—peace with God; peace with God's principles; peace with our fellowman and peace with our own conscience.

In plainer words, vice is the breeder of war.

In still plainer words, vicious men are the mongers of war.

To date, these war-makers and war-mongers have gone their prosperous way over the corpses of their fellowmen. Napoleon at St. Helena or the Kaiser at Doern, if guilty, received no adequate punishment.

Now that day has passed. Humanity is waiting to cast the noose about the neck of the vicious men who created war.

In an editorial in the *Times-Herald* of Washington, D. C. (Feb. 24) we read:

The trial of Daladier and Blum in France may be the beginning of a new era of justice and of peace on this earth.

If we are to have a better and a happier world, it is surely time that the men responsible for the murder and misery of war should be tried and convicted and deservedly punished for the highest of all crimes against heaven and humanity.

It is to be hoped that the guilty will be convicted in France and that their prosecution and conviction will afford an example—a precedent—which all the other outraged peoples of the world will follow.

Daladier is accused of having projected his nation, though unprepared, into a war where hundreds of thousands of his people were slain, millions rendered destitute, millions made to mourn throughout their lives because of the loss of loved ones.

Blum is accused of being responsible for the unpreparedness which Daladier inherited.

He is blamed for coddling the Communists and the anarchists when they were undermining the strength of France by strikes and sabotage, and every kind of obstruction to progress and production.

He is arraigned for having wasted the wealth of France in political boondoggling in compelling the payment of the preposterous increases that disloyal strikers demanded through force and violence.

He is indicted for buying political popularity at the expense of a plundered people, for hampering and even destroying the industries of France, and for having filled the public offices of France with political bureaucrats loyal to nothing but themselves and the regime which kept them in place and power . . .

But the question is not merely whether Blum destroyed the wealth of France in his persistent endeavor to buy the ballots to sustain his party in power.

It is not, indeed, wholly a question of whether Daladier led his nation into war, knowing its financial weakness and its military and industrial unpreparedness.

The point that holds out a bright promise for a better future is that leaders who project their nations into war are already being prosecuted, with fair hope of punishment, for their failures in war.

The only remaining step to be taken in the interests of absolute justice, and in the hope and promise of enduring peace, is that leaders—whether unsuccessful or successful—shall be prosecuted for involving their nations in war without the registered and recorded consent and approval of the people who must wage the war, and endure the sufferings of the war and make the sacrifice of wealth and welfare, and life and liberty which war requires and entails . . .

There will be no peace, and no fundamental justice, until the people themselves decide by direct vote what rights and liberties, what ideals and institutions must be promoted or defended, and whether those high principles and basic policies can best be promoted or defended by peace or by war.

Any ruler who shall hereafter usurp this fundamental right of the people themselves should be deemed and declared not only a traitor to his own nation, but to liberty and to democracy and to all humanity.

Was the Pension Bill a Trick to Disparage Congress? See Page 7